BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD POLICY, RESEARCH, AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE

IN THE	MATTER	OF T	HE:	
POLICY,	RESEAR	CH A	ND	
TECHNICAL AS	SSISTAN	CE)	
COMMITTEE M	EETING)	
				_)

DATE AND TIME: TUESDAY, MARCH 18, 1997

9:30 A.M.

PLACE: BOARD HEARING ROOM

8800 CAL CENTER DRIVE SACRAMENTO,

CALIFORNIA

REPORTER: BETH C. DRAIN, RPR, CSR

CERTIFICATE NO. 7152

BRS FILE NO.: 37744A

APPEARANCES

MR. STEVEN R. JONES, CHAIRMAN
MR. DANIEL G. PENNINGTON, MEMBER (NOT PRESENT) MR. PAUL RELIS, MEMBER

STAFF PRESENT

MR. RALPH CHANDLER, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MR. ELLIOT BLOCK, LEGAL COUNSEL MS. JEANNINE BAKULICH, COMMITTEE SECRETARY

INDEX	
	PAGE_NO
EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS	5
ROLL CALL	9
ITEM 1: CONSIDERATION OF THE CALIFORNIA	INTEGRATED
WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD'S 50-PERCENT INIT	IATIVE,
STRATEGY NO. 38: BAN GREEN WASTE FROM L	ANDFILL
DISPOSAL FOR CITIES/COUNTIES NOT MEETING	25 PERCENT
AND/OR 50 PERCENT	
STAFF PRESENTATION	9
PUBLIC TESTIMONY	13
COMMITTEE DISCUSSION	20
ACTION	23
ITEM 2: CONSIDERATION OF THE CALIFORNIA WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD'S 50-PERCENT INIT STRATEGY NO. 41: IMPLEMENT TRANSPORT PAINITIATIVE	IATIVE,
STAFF PRESENTATION	23
PUBLIC TESTIMONY	
COMMITTEE DISCUSSION	28
ACTION	31
ITEM 3: CONSIDERATION OF THE CALIFORNIA WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD'S 50-PERCENT INIT STRATEGY NO. 40: EXPAND RESOURCE EFFICITO BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY	IATIVE,

NEGO AND INDOSTRI	
STAFF PRESENTATION	32
PUBLIC TESTIMONY	
COMMITTEE DISCUSSION	36

43

ITEM 4: CONSIDERATION OF THE CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD'S 50-PERCENT INITIATIVE, STRATEGY NO. 14 AND STRATEGY NO. 15: REQUIRE CHARGING FOR DISCLOSING TRUE COSTS OF DISPOSAL

ACTION

STAFF PRESENTATION	44
PUBLIC TESTIMONY	51
COMMITTEE DISCUSSION	50

ACTION 55

3

ITEM 5: CONSIDERATION OF THE CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD'S 50-PERCENT INITIATIVE, STRATEGY NO. 12, STRATEGY NO. 13, AND STRATEGY NO. 39: PROMOTE OR REQUIRE UNIT PRICING FOR CITIES AND COUNTIES

STAFF PRESENTATION		56
PUBLIC TESTIMONY		64
COMMITTEE DISCUSSION	63,	69
ACTION		78

ITEM 6: CONSIDERATION OF THE CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD'S 50-PERCENT INITIATIVE, STRATEGY NO. 3, STRATEGY NO. 16, AND STRATEGY NO. 24:

A. STRATEGY NO. 3: EXEMPT RURAL JURISDICTIONS FROM DIVERSION PLANNING AND GOALS

B. STRATEGY NO. 16: ALLOW SALES OF DIVERSION ABOVE MANDATED GOALS

C. STRATEGY NO. 24: ALLOW TRANSFORMATION TO COUNT FOR MORE THAN 10-PERCENT DIVERSION FOR 50-PERCENT DIVERSION GOAL

STAFF PRESENTATION	79
PUBLIC TESTIMONY	84, 97, 101
COMMITTEE DISCUSSION	89, 91, 97
	101, 116
ACTION	84, 98, 123

ITEM 7: CONSIDERATION OF THE CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD'S 50-PERCENT INITIATIVE, STRATEGY NO. 11: PROVIDE A STUDY WHICH WILL IDENTIFY POTENTIAL ADDITIONAL SOURCES OF FUNDING FOR DIVERSION PROGRAMS OF LOCAL JURISDICTIONS

STAFF PRESENTATION	123
PUBLIC TESTIMONY	
COMMITTEE DISCUSSION	
ACTION	127

ITEM 8: OPEN DISCUSSION NONE

ITEM 9: ADJOURNMENT 128

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA; TUESDAY, MARCH 18, 1997 1 2 9:30 A.M. 3 4 CHAIRMAN JONES: MORNING, LADIES AND 5 GENTLEMEN. WELCOME TO THE MARCH 18TH POLICY, RESEARCH, AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE 6 7 MEETING. THERE'S SPEAKER SLIPS IN THE BACK FOR 8 ANYBODY TO -- THAT WANTS TO SPEAK TO AN ITEM. AND 9 SO GO AHEAD AND FILL THOSE OUT AND BRING THEM UP TO JEANNINE AND LORI IF YOU WANT TO SPEAK ON AN 10 11 ITEM. 12 THE CHAIRMAN IS NOT GOING TO BE HERE 13 TODAY. HE HAS EITHER A TOUCH OF FOOD POISONING OR 14 A TOUCH OF THE FLU, SO HE CALLED EARLY THIS 15 MORNING, SO WE'RE GOING TO PROCEED ON WITH MR. 16 RELIS AND I. 17 AS FAR AS -- ARE THERE ANY EX 18 PARTES? 19 MEMBER RELIS: MINE ARE ALL RECORDED. 20 CHAIRMAN JONES: WE RECEIVED SOME FAXES

21 AND SOME LATE CORRESPONDENCE THIS MORNING AND

LAST

- 22 NIGHT. ONE FROM LIZ CITRINO FROM HUMBOLDT COUNTY,
- 23 TALKING ABOUT THE ITEMS IN FRONT OF THIS
- 24 COMMITTEE. ANOTHER FROM THE COUNTY OF ORANGE

FROM

25 THE -- THEY HAVE A GROUP, CONSORTIUM OF THE CITIES

- 1 AND COUNTIES, TALKING ABOUT THE STRATEGY ITEMS.
- 2 AND THEN I THINK THIS HAS BEEN RECORDED ON EX
- 3 PARTE, BUT WE HAVE THE LETTER AND A PACKAGE OF
- 4 LETTERS FROM RCRC, DEALING WITH THE RURAL COUNTY
- 5 EXEMPTION. THOSE, I THINK, ARE IN THE RECORD.
- 6 THE -- AS WELL AS ONE FROM LAKEWOOD THAT JUST CAME
- 7 IN THIS MORNING. I THINK ALL THE BOARD MEMBERS
- 8 HAVE A COPY OF THAT.
- 9 WE -- AS EVERYBODY KNOWS, WE'VE BEEN
- 10 WORKING ON THE STRATEGIES TO GET FROM 25 PERCENT
- 11 TO 50 PERCENT. THIS PROCESS HAS BEEN GOING ON FOR
- 12 OUITE A FEW MONTHS. IT'S INVOLVED A LOT OF PUBLIC
- 13 COMMENT AND A LOT OF STAFF WORK, AND I WANT TO
- 14 THANK THE STAFF FOR GOING THROUGH THESE THINGS AND
- 15 THROUGH THIS PROCESS. THEY'VE DONE A GOOD JOB IN
- 16 PREPARING THESE ITEMS.
- 17 I ALSO WANT TO MAKE MY VIEWS CLEAR,
- 18 THAT AS WE GO FORWARD INTO THIS NEXT STAGE AT THE
- 19 WASTE BOARD, BECAUSE OF THE SUCCESSES OF AB 939
- 20 AND THE FACT THAT OUR WASTESTREAM HAS BEEN REDUCED
- 21 STATEWIDE BY OVER 25 PERCENT, THE OBVIOUS IMPACT
- 22 TO THAT IS THAT OUR FUNDING HAS BEEN REDUCED. AND
- 23 AS RESULT OF THAT, WE NEED TO BECOME MORE FOCUSED
- 24 ON WHERE WE'RE GOING TO TAKE THIS ORGANIZATION
- 25 OVER THE NEXT FIVE YEARS, FOUR OR FIVE YEARS, IN

- 1 REACHING THE GOALS.
- 2 SO I THINK THE SHOTGUN PATTERN OF
- 3 TRYING TO BE ALL THINGS TO ALL PEOPLE AND WORKING
- 4 ON EVERY IDEA THAT COMES DOWN THE ROAD HAS PRETTY
- 5 MUCH LIVED OUT ITS -- ITS TIME. AND NOW WE NEED
- 6 TO FOCUS ON THOSE ITEMS THAT ARE GOING TO HELP

GET

- 7 CITIES AND COUNTIES AND THE STATE TO THE
- 8 50-PERCENT GOAL.
- 9 SO WHILE I THINK A LOT OF THESE

44

- 10 IDEAS, WHICH I THINK WERE TRIMMED DOWN FROM A
- 11 COUPLE OF HUNDRED, ARE VALID, THERE ARE SOME WE
- 12 CANNOT EXPEND THE TIME. I LOOK AT THAT PROCESS

AS

- 13 A STEP IN DEVELOPING A BUSINESS PLAN FOR THE
- 14 INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD SO THAT WE

CAN

15 CHANGE THE WAY WE DO THINGS. WE LOOK AT

FOCUSING

- ON A MORE VALUE -- ON CONTINUING TO BE A VALUE-
- 17 ADDED DEPARTMENT AND SERVICE.
- 18 SO I THINK PEOPLE NEED TO

UNDERSTAND

19 THAT, THAT SOME OF THESE ITEMS COULD GO DOWN IN

- 20 FLAMES AND THEY'RE GOING DOWN IN FLAMES BECAUSE
- THE VALUE MAY NOT BE THERE AS FAR AS GETTING US

TO

22 THAT 50-PERCENT GOAL. SO WITH THAT, MS.

TRGOVCICH

- 23 AND HER CREW OF MANY.
- MS. TRGOVCICH: HARD TO FOLLOW GOING

DOWN

25 IN FLAMES. GOOD MORNING, MR. CHAIRMAN AND

- 1 MEMBERS. THE AGENDA BEFORE YOU THIS MORNING
- 2 CONTAINS ALL ITEMS PERTAINING TO THE 50-PERCENT
- 3 INITIATIVE. THE WASTE PREVENTION AND MARKET
- 4 DEVELOPMENT DIVISION HAS THE LEAD FOR THE FIRST
- 5 THREE ITEMS. AND FOLLOWING THAT YOU WILL SEE
- 6 REPRESENTATIVES OF THE POLICY AND ANALYSIS OFFICE.
- 7 THE ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DIVISION, AS WELL AS
 - 8 OTHER DIVISIONS AND OFFICES IN THE ORGANIZATION
 - 9 PRESENTING SUBSEQUENT ITEMS. SO I WILL BE
- 10 PRESENTING THE FIRST THREE ITEMS AND THEN

MOVING

- 11 ON TO OTHER PRESENTERS.
- JUST BY WAY OF BACKDROP, AND I
- 13 THINK, CHAIRMAN JONES, YOU DID A VERY GOOD JOB

ΙN

- 14 DESCRIBING WHAT THESE ARE IS A BOILED-DOWN VERSION
- 15 OF THE INITIAL LARGE NUMBER OF IDEAS OR STRATEGIES
- 16 AND THE BOILED DOWN LIST WHICH THE BOARD ARRIVED
- 17 AT AT ITS JANUARY MEETING THAT WAS THEN REFERRED

18	OUT TO THE BOARD'S VARIOUS COMMITTEES FOR
POLICY	
19	CONSIDERATION.
20	THE FIRST ITEM BEFORE YOU THIS
21	MORNING IS CONSIDERATION OF THE CALIFORNIA
22	INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD'S 50-PERCENT
23	INITIATIVE, STRATEGY NO. 38: BAN GREEN WASTE
FROM	
24 25	LANDFILL DISPOSAL FOR CITIES AND COUNTIES NOT MEETING THE 25- AND/OR 50-PERCENT MANDATE.

- 1 CHAIRMAN JONES: BEFORE YOU GO ON WITH
- 2 THAT, SINCE THIS IS MY SECOND MEETING AND I DO
- 3 THIS SO WELL, DO WE NEED TO TAKE THE ROLL TO MAKE
- 4 SURE WE HAVE A QUORUM HERE? I'M GETTING NOTES
- 5 FROM PEOPLE SAYING YOU'RE BLOWING IT, YOU KNOW.
- THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER RELIS.
- 7 MEMBER RELIS: HERE.
- 8 THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN JONES.
- 9 CHAIRMAN JONES: HERE.
- 10 THE SECRETARY: AND BOARD MEMBER
- 11 PENNINGTON ABSENT.
- 12 CHAIRMAN JONES: THANK YOU. SORRY ABOUT
- 13 THAT.
- 14 MS. TRGOVCICH: NO PROBLEMS.
- 15 BY WAY OF INTRODUCTION TO THIS

FIRST

- 16 ITEM, WHICH FOCUSES ON STRATEGY NO. 38, THIS WAS
- Α
- 17 STRATEGY THAT THE BOARD AGREED TO HAVE GREATER
- 18 POLICY CONSIDERATION AT A SUBSEQUENT COMMITTEE
- 19 MEETING, WHICH IS THE MEETING WE'RE AT HERE THIS
- 20 MORNING. THE INFORMATION THAT STAFF'S GOING TO
- BE
- 21 PRESENTING TO YOU AROUND THIS STRATEGY THAT WAS
- 22 REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE INCLUDES A DISCUSSION

- THE CONCEPT ITSELF, SOME ASSUMPTIONS BEHIND THE
- 24 CONCEPT, WHAT IT WOULD TAKE TO IMPLEMENT THE
- 25 STRATEGY.

- 1 AS A BOARD, AS YOU SAID, WITH
- 2 LIMITED RESOURCES, WHAT WOULD BE NECESSARY TO GET
- 3 TO THAT POINT. WHAT IS THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE
- 4 STRATEGY TO OTHER BOARD ACTIVITIES? WHAT ARE THE
- 5 KEY ISSUES AROUND THE STRATEGY? AND I THINK THE
- 6 STAFF HAS DONE A VERY GOOD JOB IN LAYING OUT THE
- 7 PROS AND CONS. AND THEY WILL ALSO BE PROVIDING
- 8 YOU WITH OTHER INFORMATION UPON WHICH YOU CAN
- 9 COMPARE AND CONTRAST THIS STRATEGY WITH OTHER
- 10 EFFORTS AS WE ROLL THROUGH OUR DISCUSSIONS THIS
- 11 MORNING.
- 12 WITH THAT, I'D LIKE TO TURN THE
- 13 PRESENTATION OVER TO BILL ORR AND TOM ESTES, AND
- 14 THEY WILL PROCEED TO TAKE YOU THROUGH THIS ITEM.
- MR. ESTES: GOOD MORNING, MR. CHAIRMAN.
- 16 AS CAREN SAID, I'LL BE DISCUSSING STRATEGY 38:
- 17 BANNING GREEN WASTE FROM LANDFILL DISPOSAL FOR
- 18 CITIES AND COUNTIES NOT MEETING THEIR 25-PERCENT
- 19 AND/OR 50-PERCENT GOALS.
- 20 THE BASIS FOR THIS STRATEGY, AS IT
- 21 CAME UP THROUGH THE 50-PERCENT REVIEW, WAS THAT 25
- 22 STATES AROUND THE NATION HAVE SOME FORM OF YARD
- 23 WASTE BAN IN PLACE, BE THAT LEAVES OR ALL THE WAY
- 24 THROUGH ALL THE YARD TRIMMINGS. SO IT WAS
- 25 EVALUATED ON THAT BASIS.

- SOME OF THE PROS UNDER THIS BAN OR
- 2 THIS STRATEGY WOULD BE THAT IT WILL INCREASE GREEN
- 3 WASTE AVAILABLE FOR OTHER USES PRETTY MUCH
- 4 IMMEDIATELY -- IF I CAN GET ON THE RIGHT SLIDE
- 5 HERE. IT INCREASES DIVERSION BY UP TO 15 PERCENT
- 6 WHERE IMPOSED, AND THERE IS SOME DISCUSSION THAT
- 7 THAT MAY BE HIGHER IN CERTAIN COMMUNITIES GIVEN
- 8 THE FACT THAT THE MEASUREMENT WAS TAKEN DURING A
- 9 PRETTY SEVERE DROUGHT.
- 10 IT'S SEEN AS AN EFFECTIVE
- 11 ALTERNATIVE FOR THE \$10,000 A DAY FINE. IF THIS
- 12 WERE IMPOSED ON A COMMUNITY WHERE APPLICABLE, IT
- 13 WOULD RESULT IN REAL DIVERSION. THIS CLEARLY
- 14 WOULD RESULT IN -- A BAN WOULD CLEARLY RESULT IN
- 15 HIGHER PARTICIPATION RATES WHERE OTHER PROGRAMS
- 16 TEND TO BE VOLUNTARY. THIS ONE WOULD BE ABSOLUTE.
- 17 AS A MATTER OF FACT, I JUST GOT OFF
- 18 THE PHONE WITH MICHIGAN THIS MORNING, AND THEY SAY
- 19 THAT THEIR BAN IS EXPERIENCING ABOUT A 95-PERCENT
- 20 PARTICIPATION RATE.
- 21 MEMBER RELIS: PARTICIPATION RATE IN A
- 22 BAN.
- 23 MR. ESTES: THIS WOULD NOT PENALIZE --
- 24 MEMBER RELIS: INTERESTING CONCEPT.
- 25 MR. ESTES: DIDN'T USE THE WORD

- 1 "OPTIMIZE." WOULD NOT PENALIZE JURISDICTIONS THAT
- 2 MEET THE GOALS.
- 3 ON THE DOWNSIDE, WE HAVE A VERY
- 4 SHORT TIME TO IMPLEMENT SUCH A THING. AND WE'VE
- 5 ASSUMED THAT THIS WOULD AT LEAST TAKE THE FULL TWO
- 6 YEARS OF THE LEGISLATIVE SESSION, PERHAPS LONGER,
- 7 AND THEN REGULATION. SO THAT BUMPS US REALLY
- 8 CLOSE TO THE YEAR 2000.
- 9 ONE OF THE OTHER NET RESULTS IS THIS
- 10 MAY INCREASE ILLEGAL DUMPING AND OPEN BURNING IF
- 11 IT WERE IMPOSED. THERE WOULD BE ADMINISTRATIVE
- 12 DIFFICULTIES IN IMPLEMENTING A JURISDICTIONAL BAN
- 13 WITH ALL THE COUNTING AND PLANNING REQUIREMENTS.
- 14 AND THEN, OF COURSE, COMPLIANCE WOULD BE DIFFICULT
- 15 AND EXPENSIVE, AND THE RESPONSIBILITY WOULD LAND
- 16 PRETTY SQUARELY ON THE HAULERS AND LANDFILL
- 17 OPERATORS.
- 18 THE COMMITTEE OPTIONS BEFORE YOU
- 19 RELATED TO THIS ITEM WOULD BE TO PURSUE THE
- 20 STRATEGY, WHICH WOULD, IN EFFECT, DIRECT STAFF TO
- 21 IDENTIFY THOSE STATES WITH SUCCESSFUL BANS AND
- 22 REALLY ASSESS WHAT MAKES THEM SUCCESSFUL AND WHY
- 23 THEY WORK, TO CONDUCT PUBLIC DISCUSSIONS HERE IN
- 24 CALIFORNIA TO DETERMINE THE RAMIFICATIONS OF WHAT
- 25 A BAN WOULD MEAN TO LOCAL JURISDICTIONS, AND THEN

- 1 AT THAT POINT DECIDE WHETHER OR NOT TO PURSUE
- 2 LEGISLATION. AND THAT, OF COURSE, WOULD BE ON A
- 3 FAST TRACK. AND THEN, OF COURSE, THE OTHER OPTION
- 4 WOULD BE NOT TO PURSUE THIS STRATEGY. AND I CAN
- 5 ENTERTAIN ANY QUESTIONS IF YOU LIKE.
- 6 MEMBER RELIS: NO QUESTIONS. I'LL HAVE
- 7 SOME COMMENTS.
- 8 CHAIRMAN JONES: WE'VE GOT -- THANK YOU.
- 9 WE'VE GOT THREE SPEAKER CARDS. RICHARD DICKSON
- 10 FROM COLUSA COUNTY.
- 11 MR. DICKSON: GOOD MORNING, CHAIRMAN
- JONES, COMMITTEE MEMBERS. MY NAME IS RICHARD
- 13 DICKSON. I'M THE ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE ANALYST
- 14 FOR COLUSA COUNTY AND A MEMBER OF RCRC ESJPA.
- 15 WOULD LIKE TO ADDRESS THE ABOVE-LISTED RECOMMEN-
- 16 DATION NO. 38 AS A MEMBER OF THE REGIONAL COUNCIL
- 17 OF RURAL COUNTIES ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES JOINT
- 18 POWERS AUTHORITY AND AS ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE
- 19 ANALYST FOR COLUSA COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS.
- 20 YOUR COMMITTEE HAS BEEN PROVIDED
- 21 WITH A LIST OF POSITIONS THAT RCRC HAS TAKEN ON
- 22 ITEMS YOU WILL BE ADDRESSING TODAY. I WOULD LIKE
- 23 TO EXPAND ON AND ADD TO THAT POSITION FROM MY
- 24 PERSPECTIVE ON RECOMMENDATION NO. 38.
- 25 I WOULD FIRST LIKE TO STATE THAT

- 1 THIS RECOMMENDATION IS VERY INCONSISTENT WITH
- 2 CURRENT PRACTICES THAT CIWMB IS ENDORSING.
- 3 JURISDICTIONS ARE ALLOWED TO USE GREEN WASTE AS
- 4 ALTERNATIVE DAILY COVER IN LANDFILLS TO REACH
- 5 THEIR 25- AND 50-PERCENT MANDATES. THIS
- 6 RECOMMENDATION WOULD REQUIRE JURISDICTIONS THAT DO
- 7 NOT MEET THAT MANDATE TO BAN PLACEMENT OF GREEN
- 8 WASTE IN LANDFILLS.
- 9 IT WOULD APPEAR THAT THIS IS GOOD
- 10 PRACTICE FOR JURISDICTIONS WITH HIGH GREEN WASTE
- 11 GENERATION TO LANDFILL THE MATERIAL AS ADC WHILE
- 12 THOSE WITH VERY LITTLE GREEN WASTE GENERATIONS
- 13 WOULD BE BANNED FROM LANDFILLING THE SAME
- 14 MATERIAL.
- 15 THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION GENERALIZES
- 16 THAT GREEN WASTES ARE 20 PERCENT OF THE
- 17 WASTESTREAM. THIS MAY BE TRUE OF THE STATE AS A
- 18 WHOLE, BUT IT IS FAR FROM THE TRUTH IN MANY
- 19 JURISDICTIONS. SOME JURISDICTIONS WITHIN THE
- 20 ESJPA HAVE GREEN WASTE GENERATION BELOW 5 PERCENT.
- ONE OF THE PROBLEMS WITH THE 50-PERCENT MANDATE IS
- 22 THE ESCALATING COSTS OF DIVERTING SMALLER AND
- 23 SMALLER PERCENTAGES OF WASTESTREAMS. THE

SMALL

24 PERCENTAGE WASTES ARE POOR PLACES FOR RURAL

AND 25

SMALL JURISDICTIONS TO USE THEIR FUNDING.

- 1 THE REASON THE WASTE GENERATION
- 2 STUDIES -- THE REASON FOR THE WASTE GENERATION
- 3 STUDIES IS TO DETERMINE THE BEST PLACE TO USE
- 4 THOSE DIVERSION DOLLARS. WILL THE STATE NOW NOT
- 5 ONLY MANDATE THE AMOUNT OF DIVERSION, BUT ALSO
- 6 MANDATE WHAT WASTE EACH JURISDICTION MUST DIVERT?
- 7 BANNING GREEN WASTE FROM LANDFILL
- 8 WILL ALSO INCREASE THE AMOUNTS OF BURNING WASTE IN
- 9 RURAL COUNTIES. ONE SOLID WASTE FACILITY CAN
- 10 SERVE MANY JURISDICTIONS. IF THERE'S A BAN ON
- 11 GREEN WASTE, WOULD THAT FACILITY BE REQUIRED TO
- 12 CONDUCT LOADCHECKING PROGRAMS FOR GREEN WASTE?
- 13 THIS WOULD REQUIRE A JURISDICTION TO POLICE THE
- 14 DISPOSAL HABITS OF EACH AND EVERY PERSON IN THAT
- 15 JURISDICTION.
- 16 I MUST SAY THAT THIS RECOMMENDATION
- 17 MAY BE WELL INTENDED, BUT IT IS NOT VERY WELL
- 18 THOUGHT OUT. I HOPE YOU WILL CONSIDER THESE
- 19 STATEMENTS IN YOUR DETERMINATION OF THE VIABILITY
- 20 OF RECOMMENDATION NO. 38.
- 21 CHAIRMAN JONES: THANK YOU, MR. DICKSON.
- 22 ANY QUESTIONS? THANK YOU. MR. JOHN BROOKS FROM
- 23 RCRC.
- 24 MR. BROOKS: MORNING, CHAIRMAN AND
- 25 COMMITTEE MEMBER. GLAD TO BE BACK AGAIN TODAY.

- 1 AND I WANTED TO ADDRESS THIS ONE ITEM, AND THEN
- 2 I'LL LET THE REST OF OUR MEMBERS TAKE OVER FOR THE
- 3 REST OF THIS COMMITTEE, BUT I'D LIKE TO GO ON
- 4 RECORD AS OPPOSING NO. 38.
- 5 WE BELIEVE IT WOULD BE PREMATURE FOR
- THE MARKETS, COMPOST/MULCH MARKETS, THEY'RE IN
- 7 THEIR INFANCY, AND TO PUT A LOT MORE MATERIAL INTO
- 8 THE MARKETS RIGHT NOW COULD DESTROY THEM.
- 9 CURRENTLY THERE ARE PROPOSALS THAT
- 10 ARE BEING GENERATED THAT WOULD SIGNIFICANTLY
- 11 INCREASE THE AMOUNT OF BIOMASS AND GREEN WASTE
- 12 THAT WOULD BE GOING TO MARKETS. ONE IS THE FIRE
- 13 REDUCTION STRATEGIES. THE REGIONAL COUNCIL OF
- 14 RURAL COUNTIES HAS BEEN WORKING THE LAST YEAR WITH
- 15 CAL FED, A DELTA ACCORD, TO TRY AND GET
- 16 REINVESTMENT IN THE UPPER WATERSHED TO BECOME A
- 17 REALITY. THIS WOULD REDUCE THE FIRE LOADINGS IN
- 18 OUR TIMBERLANDS. THE RESULT OF THAT IS GREEN
- 19 WASTE OUT OF THE TIMBERLANDS AND LOOKING FOR
- 20 OPTIONS TO MARKET THOSE MATERIALS, HOPEFULLY
- 21 SOMETHING OTHER THAN SLASH BURNING.
- 22 AT THIS POINT WE HAVEN'T

IDENTIFIED

23 GOOD MARKETS FOR THAT MATERIAL, LET ALONE

ΙF

24 THERE'S A BAN ON GREEN WASTE DISPOSAL

ADDING TO
25 THE PROBLEM. RICHARD DICKSON ALLUDED TO SOME OF

- 1 OUR COUNTIES AND CITIES THAT HAVE LESS THAN
- 2 5-PERCENT DISPOSAL OF GREEN WASTE. CITY OF
- 3 MAMMOTH LAKES IS ONE OF THOSE. THEY HAVE LESS
- 4 THAN 5-PERCENT GREEN WASTE DISPOSAL. THE MAJORITY
- 5 OF THAT IS PINE NEEDLES, WHICH THERE'S NOT A LOT
- 6 YOU CAN DO WITH PINE NEEDLES THAT WE'VE FOUND YET.
- 7 I THINK YOU WOULD HAVE TO LOOK AT
- 8 THAT ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS TO SEE WHAT IS
- 9 ACTUALLY VIABLE. AND OPEN BURNING IS STILL LEGAL
- 10 IN MANY OF THE RURAL AREAS, SO IT WOULD LEAD TO AN
- 11 INCREASE IN THE OPEN BURN. AND CURRENTLY THAT IS
- 12 THE PRACTICE IN MANY AREAS FOR NOT ONLY GREEN
- 13 WASTE, BUT FOR OTHER WASTE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES IN
- 14 MANY OF OUR AREAS.
- 15 WITH THAT, I'D LIKE TO CONCLUDE AND
- 16 JUST REQUEST THAT YOU NOT CONSIDER THIS ITEM ANY
- 17 FURTHER. THANK YOU.
- 18 CHAIRMAN JONES: QUESTIONS? THANKS, MR.
- 19 BROOKS. LAST -- THE LAST PERSON TO SPEAK, CHUCK
- 20 WHITE FROM WASTE MANAGEMENT INCORPORATED.
- 21 MR. WHITE: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN,
- 22 MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE. IT'S CHARLES WHITE WITH
- 23 WASTE MANAGEMENT INCORPORATED. FIRST OF ALL, I
- 24 WOULD LIKE TO SAY THAT WASTE MANAGEMENT WOULD NOT
- 25 AND DOES NOT SUPPORT A BAN ON GREEN WASTE

- 1 CERTAINLY AT THE PRESENT POINT IN TIME FOR A WHOLE
- VARIETY OF REASONS. FIRST OF ALL, IT'S CLEARLY
- 3 INCONSISTENT WITH RECENT LEGISLATION AND REGULA-
- 4 TIONS, WHICH ALLOW THE USE OF GREEN WASTE AS ADC.
- 5 AND IT WOULD APPEAR TO BE COMPLETELY INCONSISTENT
- 6 WITH THIS RECENT LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY
- 7 ACTION.
- 8 WASTE MANAGEMENT DOES SUPPORT A
- 9 NUMBER OF ACTIVITIES THAT SHOULD BE SERIOUSLY
- 10 CONSIDERED BY THIS COMMITTEE AND THE BOARD WITH
- 11 RESPECT TO DEVELOPING MARKETS FOR GREEN WASTE
- 12 MATERIALS OR FINDING WAYS TO PROVIDE FLEXIBILITY
- FOR JURISDICTIONS TO COMPLY WITH THE AB 939

GOALS,

- 14 BUT CREATING AN ARTIFICIAL BAN, WE THINK, IS
- 15 TOTALLY INAPPROPRIATE AND WOULD HAVE A HUGE

RIPPLE

- 16 EFFECT IN THE ENTIRE MARKETPLACE AND HAVE MANY OF
- 17 THE ADVERSE CONSEQUENCES SOME OF THE PREVIOUS
- 18 SPEAKERS ALLUDED TO.
- 19 WE BELIEVE IT WOULD PROMOTE
- 20 INEFFICIENT HANDLING AND MANAGEMENT OF GREEN
- 21 WASTE. IT WOULD SUBSTANTIALLY WARP, AS I SAID,
- 22 THE MARKETPLACE FOR THESE KINDS OF MATERIALS.
- 23 WHAT YOU NEED TO DO IS PROMOTE

COST-

24 EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT GREEN WASTE DIVERSION 25 PROGRAMS. DO NOT NEED TO FORCE JURISDICTIONS TO

- 1 SEEK INEFFECTIVE OR POTENTIALLY INAPPROPRIATE
- 2 DIVERSION STRATEGIES, SUCH AS POTENTIALLY ILLEGAL
- 3 DISPOSAL OR ILLEGAL HANDLING METHODS.
- 4 FINALLY, THE REAL PERTINENT REASON,
- 5 I THINK, IS IT'S NOT YET TIMELY TO CONSIDER THIS
- 6 AS AN ISSUE, CERTAINLY SOMETHING AS DRASTIC AS A
- 7 BAN. A BAN SHOULD ONLY BE CONSIDERED AS A LAST
- 8 RESORT ONLY IF ALL OTHER METHODS HAVE FAILED. WE
- 9 WON'T KNOW WHETHER ALL OTHER METHODS HAVE FAILED
- 10 UNTIL THE YEAR 2000 OR SHORTLY THEREAFTER, 2001,
- 11 2002.
- 12 AT THAT POINT IN TIME, IF WE ARE TO
- 13 SERIOUSLY CONSIDER BANS, THAT WOULD BE THE
- 14 APPROPRIATE TIME TO TAKE UP THIS FURTHER
- 15 DISCUSSION. SO FOR THE TIME BEING, WE WOULD
- 16 STRONGLY URGE THIS COMMITTEE AND THE BOARD TO DROP
- 17 FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF BANS AT THIS TIME.
- 18 CHAIRMAN JONES: THANK YOU. MR. JACK
- 19 MICHAEL.
- 20 MR. MICHAEL: MR. CHAIRMAN, MR. RELIS,
- 21 I'M JACK MICHAEL, REPRESENTING THE COUNTY OF LOS
- 22 ANGELES. I WOULD ECHO THE COMMENTS MADE BY THE
- 23 PREVIOUS SPEAKERS. CERTAINLY A BAN ON GREEN WASTE
- 24 MIGHT RESULT IN DIVERSION FROM PERMITTED FACILI-
- 25 TIES, BUT PROBABLY WOULD RESULT IN THE DISPOSAL OF

- 1 THE MATERIAL IN A WHOLE LOT OF UNPERMITTED
- 2 FACILITIES CALLED NORMALLY ILLEGAL DUMPING, WHICH
- 3 WOULD BE A BIG CONCERN TO US.
- 4 ALSO, I AGREE WITH MR. WHITE, THAT I
- 5 THINK A BAN ON ANY MATERIAL IS PREMATURE IN TERMS
- 6 OF ADDRESSING WHETHER WE MEET 50 PERCENT AND WOULD
- 7 STRONGLY URGE THE COMMITTEE NOT TO MOVE FORWARD
- 8 WITH THIS CONCEPT.
- 9 CHAIRMAN JONES: THANK YOU, MR. MICHAEL.
- 10 OKAY. THERE'S NO OTHER SLIPS UP HERE FOR PUBLIC
- 11 COMMENT. MR. RELIS.
- 12 MEMBER RELIS: MR. CHAIR, COUPLE OF
- 13 COMMENTS ON STRATEGY 38. INITIALLY, JUST A
- 14 CLARIFICATION, I THINK THE IDEA OF A BAN -- THIS
- 15 IS JUST CLARIFICATION -- WOULD NOT AFFECT, IF WE
- 16 WERE TO GO THIS ROUTE, AND I'M NOT SAYING WE
- 17 SHOULD, BUT IT WOULD NOT AFFECT THE ADC ISSUE
- 18 BECAUSE YOU WOULDN'T ALLOW IT, BUT YOU WOULD BE
- 19 ALLOWING IT FOR THAT USE. THAT'S MY
- 20 UNDERSTANDING.
- MR. ESTES: THAT'S CORRECT.
- 22 MEMBER RELIS: JUST CLARIFY THAT. OKAY.
- NOW, SPEAKING TO THE SPECIFICS OF A
- 24 BAN, I THINK, FIRST OF ALL, LOOKING AT OUR TIME
- 25 HORIZON, THERE IS NO LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL THAT I'M

- 1 AWARE OF SEEKING A BAN IN THIS LEGISLATIVE
- 2 SESSION. SO PRACTICALLY SPEAKING, THE LEGISLATURE
- 3 HAS NOT SPOKEN TO THIS MATTER IN THIS SESSION.
- 4 SO BEING A PRAGMATIST AND BEING
- 5 FOCUSED ON WHAT WE CAN ACCOMPLISH, I WOULD SAY
- 6 THAT WE'RE NOT GOING TO SEE THAT THIS YEAR. IT'S
- 7 NOT GOING TO HAPPEN LEGISLATIVELY. SO I DON'T
- 8 THINK IT'S A PRIORITY FROM THAT STANDPOINT. IT'S
- 9 NOT TO SAY DOWN THE LINE THAT I'D RULE IT OUT IF
- 10 WE WERE NOT MAKING SUFFICIENT HEADWAY ON THE GREEN
- 11 WASTE SEGMENT OF DIVERSION.
- 12 AS YOU KNOW, I'VE SPOKEN TO THAT ON
- 13 NUMEROUS OCCASIONS AND BELIEVE THAT THE MARKETS
- 14 FOR GREEN WASTE ARE GROWING VERY RAPIDLY.
- 15 CONTRARY TO WHAT SOME SAY, I AM HEARING IN THE
- 16 FIELD THAT PEOPLE ARE HAVING TROUBLE ACCESSING
- 17 ENOUGH MATERIAL. I HOPE WE'LL BE AT THAT POINT
- 18 WHERE A COMPELLING CASE COULD BE MADE IN ANOTHER
- 19 YEAR OR TWO AT THE MOST THAT GREEN WASTE HAS
- 20 ARRIVED AS A MARKETABLE COMMODITY.
- 21 OUR RESEARCH WITH UC RIVERSIDE THAT
- 22 IS NOW CONTRACTED HAS SUGGESTED FROM -- THIS IS
- 23 FROM THE PROFESSOR CONDUCTING THAT RESEARCH --
- 24 THAT THERE IS A SUFFICIENT GREEN WASTE USAGE
- 25 POTENTIAL IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA FOR AVOCADOS AND

- 1 CITRUS ALONE TO TAKE UP ALL THE GREEN WASTE IN
- 2 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA. WHETHER THAT WILL BEAR OUT,
- 3 I DON'T KNOW, BUT THAT'S FROM SOMEONE WHO IS QUITE
- 4 KNOWLEDGEABLE ABOUT THE USE OF THIS MATERIAL IN
- 5 ONE SEGMENT OF CALIFORNIA AGRICULTURE.
- 6 SO I THINK IT'S -- A BAN IS ALWAYS
- 7 AN INTRIGUING IDEA. IT SAYS 15 PERCENT. YOU
- 8 COULD GET THERE. I THINK THERE ARE A HOST OF
- 9 ISSUES THAT HAVE BEEN TOUCHED ON BY THE TESTIMONY
- 10 THAT WOULD FOLLOW FROM THAT THAT MAY HAVE
- 11 UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES.
- 12 I'M WILLING TO CONSIDER THIS IF WE
- 13 DON'T MAKE THE PROGRESS THAT I HOPE WE'LL BE
- 14 SEEING OVER THE NEXT YEAR. SO I WOULD NOT
- 15 RECOMMEND IT AS A STRATEGY AT THIS TIME.
- 16 CHAIRMAN JONES: THANK YOU, MR. RELIS.
- 17 COMING FROM A BACKGROUND OF RURAL COUNTY
- 18 MANAGEMENT AND SOLID WASTE ISSUES AS WELL AS
- 19 URBAN, MY CONCERNS WERE THE ILLEGAL DUMPING, THE
- 20 BURNING, AND NOT HAVING MARKETS SET UP OR
- 21 OPERATIONS SET UP IN AREA WHERE WE COULD -- I MEAN
- 22 YOU CAN'T HAVE A BAN WITHOUT HAVING A SOLUTION.
- 23 IF WE DON'T HAVE A SOLUTION, IT DOESN'T MAKE ANY
- 24 SENSE TO DO THAT. AND I DON'T WANT TO START
- 25 BURNING DOWN THE FORESTS AND BURNING DOWN PILES

- 1 ALL OVER -- ESPECIALLY OVER DOWN IN SOUTHERN
- 2 CALIFORNIA WHERE THEY'VE GOT SOME AIR ISSUES AND
- 3 MAY NOT BE VERY HAPPY WITH US IF WE BANNED IT.
- 4 THAT BEING SAID, I'LL ENTERTAIN A MOTION.
- 5 MEMBER RELIS: MR. CHAIR, I WOULD
- 6 RECOMMEND, FOR THE REASONS I STATED, THAT WE
- 7 RECOMMEND REJECTION OF STRATEGY 38 NOT BE
- 8 FORWARDED.
- 9 CHAIRMAN JONES: OKAY. I SECOND THAT.
- 10 COULD YOU CALL THE ROLL, JEANNINE?
- 11 THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER RELIS.
- MEMBER RELIS: AYE.
- 13 THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN JONES.
- 14 CHAIRMAN JONES: AYE. OKAY. THIS ITEM
- 15 WILL GO ON CONSENT AS A NOT TO PURSUE ITEM. THANK
- 16 YOU, STAFF.
- 17 OUR NEXT ITEM --
- 18 MS. TRGOVCICH: THE NEXT ITEM IS ITEM NO.
- 19 2, WHICH IS CONSIDERATION, ONCE AGAIN, OF THE
- 20 50-PERCENT INITIATIVE STRATEGY. THIS TIME
- 21 STRATEGY 41, WHICH IS IMPLEMENT TRANSPORT
- 22 PACKAGING INITIATIVE.
- JUST BY WAY OF A BRIEF BACKDROP, THE
- 24 CONCEPT BEHIND THE STRATEGY HAS BEEN AROUND FOR
- 25 SOME TIME BEING DEVELOPED. IT'S NEVER GOTTEN TO A

- 1 POINT OF ACTUALLY RECEIVING APPROVAL TO IMPLEMENT,
- 2 AND THAT'S THE BASIS FOR THE DISCUSSION HERE THIS
- 3 MORNING IN ONE FORM OR ANOTHER.
- 4 THERE HAVE BEEN DISCUSSIONS OVER THE
- 5 PAST SEVERAL WEEKS WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF THE
- 6 AFFECTED INDUSTRIES, AND WE HOPE TO BE BRINGING
- 7 AND SUMMARIZING THOSE DISCUSSIONS FOR YOU HERE
- 8 THIS MORNING AS WELL. KATHY FREVERT WILL BE
- 9 PRESENTING THIS ITEM ALONG WITH BILL ORR.
- 10 MS. FREVERT: THANK YOU. GOOD MORNING,
- 11 MR. CHAIRMAN AND COMMITTEE MEMBER. I'M GOING TO
- 12 BE COVERING STRATEGY NO. 41, THE TRANSPORT
- 13 PACKAGING INITIATIVE, AND I'LL START WITH A FEW
- 14 KEY POINTS.
- 15 A LOT OF TRANSPORT PACKAGING IS
- 16 RECYCLED, AND CORRUGATED CARDBOARD IS A FINE
- 17 EXAMPLE OF THIS. HOWEVER, A LOT IS STILL BEING
- 18 DISPOSED. AND OUT OF 46 WASTE TYPES, TWO OF THE
- 19 TOP FIVE ARE CORRUGATED AND WOOD PACKAGING
- 20 ACCORDING TO THE EPA. FORTUNATELY, SIGNIFICANT
- 21 OPPORTUNITY TO KEEP IT OUT OF LANDFILLS EXISTS
- 22 THROUGH EDUCATION, AND THAT'S WHAT THIS STRATEGY
- 23 IS ALL ABOUT.
- 24 OUR GOAL IS TO SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCE
- 25 PACKAGING GOING TO LANDFILLS BY THE YEAR 2000.

- 1 AND THIS WOULD BE DONE THROUGH A VOLUNTARY
- 2 PARTNERSHIP APPROACH WITH A BROAD GROUP OF STAKE-
- 3 HOLDERS TO EDUCATE PURCHASERS, HANDLERS, AND USERS
- 4 OF PACKAGING. I'D LIKE TO EMPHASIZE THERE ARE NO
- 5 MANDATES AND NO ENDORSEMENT OF THE MATERIAL TYPE.
- 6 NEXT I'M GOING TO BRIEFLY COVER THE
- 7 THREE OPTIONS IN THE AGENDA ITEM. THE FIRST IS A
- 8 TRANSPORT PACKAGING INITIATIVE. IT HAS A FOCUS ON
- 9 PACKAGING MATERIALS. THE PROCESS ENTAILS THE
- 10 FORMATION OF AN ADVISORY GROUP THAT WOULD INCLUDE
- 11 REPRESENTATIVE STAKEHOLDERS. THIS GROUP WOULD
- 12 THEN IDENTIFY EDUCATION APPROACHES AND REPORT TO
- 13 THE COMMITTEE WITH GOALS AND OBJECTIVES. THIS
- 14 OPTION, AS COMPARED TO THE OTHER TWO, GIVES US
- 15 FASTER RESULTS.
- 16 THE SECOND OPTION IS THE SHIPPING
- 17 AND DISTRIBUTION PARTNERSHIP. IT'S BROADER THAN
- 18 THE FIRST OPTION IN THAT NOT ONLY DOES IT

ADDRESS

- 19 PACKAGING, BUT IT LOOKS AT SHIPPING AND
- 20 DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS. SO IT HAS A POTENTIALLY
- 21 LARGER IMPACT.
- 22 THE PROCESS HERE WOULD ENTAIL A
- 23 MEETING FOR ALL INTERESTED STAKEHOLDERS TO
- 24 IDENTIFY EDUCATION METHODS AND REPORT TO THE
- 25 COMMITTEE WITH FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

AND

- 1 THIS IS IN CONTRAST TO GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR
- THE FIRST OPTION. AND IT CONSEQUENTLY HAS A
- 3 SOMEWHAT SLOWER TIME PERIOD FOR GETTING THE
- 4 RESULTS.
- 5 THE THIRD OPTION IS TO PURSUE THIS
- 6 AS PART OF A LARGER PROCESS, WHICH IS DOING IT AS
- 7 AN ELEMENT OF STRATEGY NO. 40, WHICH IS PROMOTE
- 8 RESOURCE EFFICIENCY. AND TERRI CRONIN, THE NEXT
- 9 SPEAKER, WILL EXPLAIN THAT IN MORE DETAIL. IT HAS
- 10 A BROADER SYSTEMS APPROACH WITH POTENTIALLY A
- 11 LARGER IMPACT.
- 12 THE PROCESS WOULD BE SIMILAR TO
- 13 OPTION 2. AND BECAUSE IT IS BROADER AND ENTAILS
- 14 MORE PEOPLE, IT WOULD BE SOMEWHAT SLOWER IN TERMS
- 15 OF IMPLEMENTING IT.
- 16 NOW FOR A FEW KEY ISSUES. ONE IS
- 17 PERCEPTIONS. A FEW PEOPLE HAVE COMMENTED
- 18 TRANSPORT PACKAGING INITIATIVE, IT SOUNDS LIKE
- 19 EUROPEAN PACKAGING LAWS. AND THEN WE'VE HEARD
- 20 VOLUNTARY TODAY, BUT ARE THERE MANDATES TOMORROW?
- 21 WELL, WE WANT TO EMPHASIZE THIS IS
- 22 AN EDUCATIONAL APPROACH. THERE ARE NO MANDATES,
- 23 AND IT IS A MARKET-DRIVEN STRATEGY.
- 24 ANOTHER KEY ISSUE HAS BEEN WHAT IS
- 25 THE AMOUNT OF CORRUGATED THAT IS RECOVERED AND

- 1 DISPOSED. EPA AND THE AMERICAN FOREST AND PAPER
- 2 ASSOCIATION HAVE DIFFERENT NUMBERS, AND WE
- 3 RECENTLY RECEIVED THE NUMBERS FROM AF&PA. WE ARE
- 4 MEETING LATER THIS WEEK WITH THEM TO DISCUSS THEM.
- OUR FIRST TAKE ON THE NUMBERS, IT
- 6 APPEARS THAT THE DIFFERENCES ARE AMONG THE KEY
- 7 VARIABLES OF WHETHER OR NOT SPROUT CUTTINGS AND
- 8 IMPORTS ARE INCLUDED OR NOT, SO THEY'RE COUNTING
- 9 DIFFERENT THINGS. LOOKING AT IT IN TERMS OF TOTAL
- 10 WASTE DISPOSED IN THE U.S., CORRUGATED COMPRISES 8
- 11 PERCENT, ACCORDING TO EPA, AND WE USED THE
- 12 NUMBERS -- THE TONNAGES PROVIDED BY AF&PA AND
- 13 COMPARED IT TO THE OTHER TONNAGES THAT EPA HAS.
- 14 AND IT TURNS OUT TO BE 6.5 PERCENT, SO IT DOES
- 15 DROP DOWN A BIT.
- 16 HOWEVER, REGARDLESS OF WHOSE DATA
- 17 YOU USE, IT STILL RANKS AS ONE OF THE TOP FIVE
- 18 TYPES OF DISCARDS. SO THEN THE KEY ISSUE IS IS
- 19 THERE SIGNIFICANT OPPORTUNITY TO KEEP MORE
- 20 PACKAGING OUT OF LANDFILLS? IN TERMS OF POTENTIAL
- 21 RECOVERY, PROJECTIONS INDICATE RECOVERY CAN
- 22 INCREASE.
- 23 AF&PA IN A RECENT LETTER STATE THAT
- 24 INDUSTRY'S GEARING UP TO ACCEPT MORE OLD CORRU-
- 25 GATED IN THE AMOUNTS OF 2.2 MILLION TONS BY THE

- 1 YEAR 1999. THIS IS NATIONWIDE.
- 2 IN A RECENT PHONE CALL WITH FRANKLIN
- 3 ASSOCIATES, THEY'RE THE ONES WHO PROVIDED THE DATA
- 4 FOR EPA, THEY ESTIMATE THAT WE'RE CURRENTLY AT
- 5 ABOUT 60-PERCENT RECOVERY AND WE CAN REACH 70
- 6 PERCENT BY THE YEAR 2000.
- 7 IN TERMS OF EFFICIENCY, WE HAVE
- 8 EXAMPLES FROM A VARIETY OF SOURCES. AND IT'S
- 9 INTERESTING TO NOTE THERE'S COST SAVINGS
- 10 ASSOCIATED WITH EFFICIENCY. THE EPA WASTE WISE
- 11 PROGRAM REPORTS \$59 MILLION IN COST SAVINGS FROM
- 12 SAVINGS IN TRANSPORT PACKAGING. SO THAT'S A NICE
- 13 INCENTIVE.
- 14 AND TO END WITH A FEW MAJOR POINTS.
- 15 PACKAGING IS TOO SIGNIFICANT TO IGNORE AND BETTER
- 16 RECOVERY AND EFFICIENCY ARE ATTAINABLE. WE SEE
- 17 OUR ROLE AS A FACILITATOR IN A PROCESS AND IN
- 18 INFORMATION EXCHANGE, A CATALYST. AND BY WORKING
- 19 WITH STAKEHOLDERS TO CREATE A BROADER EDUCATION
- 20 NETWORK AND WITH BETTER EXPERTISE, WE FEEL WE

WILL

- 21 GET THE BEST RESULTS.
- ANY QUESTIONS?
- 23 CHAIRMAN JONES: THANK YOU. I DON'T

HAVE

24 ANY SLIPS TO SPEAK ON THIS ITEM. AND I'M

AMAZED

THAT I DON'T HAVE ANY SLIPS TO SPEAK ON THIS ITEM.

- 1 I WANT TO THANK THE STAFF FOR THE EFFORTS THAT
- 2 HAVE GONE INTO THE PROCESS. THEIR EFFORTS WERE
- 3 ABOUT HOW WE COULD ACHIEVE SUCCESS AND WHAT WE
- 4 COULD DO.
- 5 AND IN THE MEETINGS THAT THEY HAD
- 6 WITH AFPA AND OTHER FOLKS, I THINK THAT THE IDEA
- 7 OF FORMING ANOTHER ALLIANCE WORKING ON THE ISSUES
- 8 FROM AN EDUCATIONAL STANDPOINT MADE AN AWFUL LOT
- 9 OF SENSE BECAUSE WE'RE NOT -- IT'S NOT THE JOB OF
- 10 THE WASTE BOARD TO PROMOTE ONE TYPE OVER ANOTHER
- 11 TYPE, I DON'T THINK. THAT WOULD BE LIKE US
- 12 ASSUMING WE COULD PROMOTE PEPSI INSTEAD OF
- 13 COCA-COLA AND NEVER THINK ABOUT THE GUY THAT WANTS
- DR. PEPPER, AND THAT'S NOT GOING TO WORK.
- 15 SO I THINK THIS EDUCATIONAL PROCESS
- 16 MAKES A LOT OF SENSE BECAUSE IT GETS ALL THOSE
- 17 PEOPLE INVOLVED THAT HAVE A STAKE IN IT. THE
- 18 OTHER THING IT DOES IT'S GOING TO PROMOTE THE
- 19 MARKET. THE MARKET IS GOING TO DRIVE WHAT KIND OF
- 20 PACKAGING PEOPLE ARE GOING TO USE, RETAILERS,
- 21 DISTRIBUTORS, THOSE TYPES OF THINGS.
- 22 SO WITH THAT, I WANT TO THANK THE
- 23 EFFORTS AND ENTERTAIN A MOTION, IF THERE IS ONE.
- 24 MEMBER RELIS: YES, MR. CHAIR. FIRST,
- 25 I'D LIKE TO ACKNOWLEDGE THE STAFF EFFORT TOO. I

- 1 THINK THERE WAS SOME CONFUSION OVER MANDATE AND
- 2 INITIATIVE.
- 3 I AM GOING TO RECOMMEND THAT WE
- 4 PURSUE OPTION 2, AND I'D LIKE TO GIVE MY REASONS
- 5 FOR THAT. FIRST OF ALL, I THINK THERE ARE A LOT
- 6 OF FACTORS SHAPING THE WHOLE TRANSPORTATION

SYSTEM

- 7 REGARDING PACKAGING TODAY. WE'RE STARTING TO
- 8 FEEL, I THINK, SOME OF THE EFFECTS OF ISO-14000,
 - 9 THE DIRECTION THAT'S GOING. I THINK WE'RE
- 10 INDIRECTLY BEGINNING TO SEE SOME OF THE IMPACTS
- 11 FROM THE EUROPEAN SYSTEM AND HOW THAT SYSTEM IS
- 12 STARTING TO INFLUENCE SHIPPING ABROAD.
- 13 BUT JUST THE OTHER DAY I WAS

FLYING

- 14 UP TO MONTEREY FROM SAN DIEGO, AND I WAS SITTING
- 15 NEXT TO, IT TURNED OUT, THREE SALESPEOPLE WHO WERE
- ON THEIR WAY TO MEET WITH TANIMURA & ANTLE.

AND

17 TANIMURA & ANTLE, T&A, FOR THOSE WHO YOU ARE

TOM

LETTUCE

18 FAMILIAR WITH THIS COMPANY, IS THE LARGEST

19	GROWER, I THINK, OR ONE OF THE LARGEST IN THE
20	STATE.
21	AND THIS GROUP WAS MAKING A PITCH
TO	
22	THEM TO USE A COMPLETELY INTEGRATED
TRANSPO	ORTATION
23	SYSTEM THAT WOULD INVOLVE THE IN-FIELD PICKING
24 25 IN	WOULD BE DONE IN A CONTAINER THAT WOULD THEN BE THE DISPLAY CONTAINER IN THE SUPERMARKET, WHICH

- 1 TURN WOULD BE THE TRANSPORT CONTAINER BACK.
- 2 SO IT WAS A COMPLETELY INTEGRATED
- 3 SYSTEM, AND THIS COMPANY IS IN THE WOOD PALLET
- 4 BUSINESS, ONE OF THE LARGER ONES. I THINK IT
- 5 MIGHT BE JEP OR SEP OR WHATEVER THAT ACRONYM IS.
- 6 THE POINT I'M TRYING TO MAKE IN ALL THIS IS THAT I
- 7 BELIEVE THAT THERE ARE SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN THE
- 8 MARKETPLACE REGARDING THE USE OF PACKAGING. I
- 9 DON'T KNOW HOW QUICKLY OR SLOWLY THIS WILL MOVE AT
- 10 THIS TIME.
- 11 I BELIEVE OUR BEST ROLE IS IN
- 12 CLARIFYING WHAT IS AVAILABLE AND DISSEMINATING
- 13 THAT INFORMATION IN A TIMELY WAY SO THAT INDUSTRY
- 14 THROUGHOUT CALIFORNIA, THE RETAIL FOOD INDUSTRY,
- 15 CAN BE MADE AWARE OF THE REVOLUTION IN PACKAGING
- 16 IN TRANSPORT CONTAINER SYSTEMS THAT ARE EMERGING
- 17 AND TO BE -- TO FACILITATE OUR GETTING THIS
- 18 INFORMATION OUT IN A BROAD FRAMEWORK. SO THAT
- 19 WOULD BE MY CHOICE, NO. 2, AND I WILL MOVE THAT.
- 20 CHAIRMAN JONES: I WILL SECOND THAT.
- 21 WOULD YOU LIKE TO CALL THE ROLL.
- 22 THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER RELIS.
- MEMBER RELIS: AYE.
- 24 THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN JONES.
- 25 CHAIRMAN JONES: AYE. THAT'S GOING TO BE

- 1 MOVED AS AN AGENDA ITEM TO THE BOARD. ALL RIGHT.
- 2 THANK YOU.
- 3 MS. TRGOVCICH: THE NEXT ITEM, CHAIRMAN
- 4 JONES, IS ITEM NO. 3 ON YOUR AGENDA, AN ADDITIONAL
- 5 50-PERCENT INITIATIVE STRATEGY. THIS IS STRATEGY
- 6 NO. 40, EXPANDING RESOURCE EFFICIENCY PROMOTION TO
- 7 BUSINESSES AND INDUSTRY. TERRI CRONIN WILL BE
- 8 PRESENTING THE STRATEGY TO YOU.
- 9 I'D JUST LIKE TO BRIEFLY SAY THAT,
- 10 AS STAFF IN THE WASTE PREVENTION AREA OF THE
- 11 BOARD, WE STRIVE ON A DAILY BASIS TO PROMOTE
- 12 RESOURCE EFFICIENCY OR DEVELOP NEW CONCEPTS OR
- 13 LOOK AT IT IN THE CONTEXT OF OUR DAILY WORK. WHAT
- 14 YOU'RE SEEING HERE IS SOMETHING MORE THAN WHAT
- 15 WE'RE CURRENTLY DOING. IT'S SOMETHING RIGHT NOW
- 16 WE INCORPORATE CERTAIN ASPECTS OF THIS STRATEGY AS
- 17 PART OF, BUT WE DO BRING INFORMATION FORWARD, AND
- 18 WHAT'S GOING TO BE PRESENTED TO YOU IS AN ENHANCE-
- 19 MENT, AN ADDITION, BEYOND WHAT WE CURRENTLY DO.
- 20 MS. CRONIN: GOOD MORNING, MR. CHAIRMAN
- 21 AND COMMITTEE MEMBER. I WILL BE TALKING ABOUT THE
- 22 STRATEGY NO. 40, WHICH IS TO PROMOTE RESOURCE
- 23 EFFICIENCY TO BUSINESSES.
- 24 FIRST, WHAT I'D LIKE TO DO IS DEFINE
- 25 WHAT THE CONCEPT OF RESOURCE EFFICIENCY IS. AND

- 1 IT'S USING RESOURCES PRODUCTIVELY WITHOUT WASTE.
- 2 AND WHEN WE TALK OF RESOURCES, WE'RE INCLUDING
- 3 MATERIALS, ENERGY, TIME, MONEY, AND OTHER INPUTS.
- 4 JUST A QUICK BACKGROUND ON WHERE WE
- 5 ARE. RESIDENTIAL PROGRAMS HAVE HELPED US ACHIEVE
- 6 25-PERCENT REDUCTION BY 1995. THE BUSINESS SECTOR
- 7 IS GOING TO PLAY A CRITICAL ROLE IN GETTING US TO
- 8 50 PERCENT BY THE YEAR 2000.
- 9 CURRENTLY LOCALS ARE IMPLEMENTING
- 10 AND EXPANDING BUSINESS WASTE REDUCTION EFFORTS AND
- 11 HAVE EXPRESSED INCREASING INTEREST IN GETTING MORE
- 12 INFORMATION AND MATERIALS FROM US.
- 13 AND FINALLY, WHEN WE LOOK AT THE
- 14 BUSINESSES, WE KNOW THAT THEY RESPOND TO BOTTOM
- 15 LINE MESSAGES.
- 16 WHY PROMOTE RESOURCE EFFICIENCY TO
- 17 BUSINESSES? FIRST OF ALL, WE FEEL IT PRESENTS A
- 18 COMPELLING MESSAGE TO ENCOURAGE BUSINESSES TO
- 19 REDUCE WASTE, AND IT REPOSITIONS OUR MESSAGE TO
- 20 FOCUS ON THE INTERESTS OF BUSINESS. AND THIS IS
- 21 REALLY CRITICAL. OUR INTEREST OBVIOUSLY IS MORE
- FOCUSED ON WASTE REDUCTION AND GETTING TO 50
- 23 PERCENT. BUSINESSES ARE MORE INTERESTED IN
- 24 INCREASING THEIR PRODUCTIVITY AND PROFITS,
- 25 DECREASING COST, AND REALIZING A RETURN ON INVEST-

- 1 MENT IN A REASONABLE PAYBACK PERIOD.
- 2 THIS ALSO SHIFTS THE FOCUS UPSTREAM
- 3 TO MORE PREVENTION AND REUSE. WE HAVE SOME
- 4 EXAMPLES OF RESOURCE EFFICIENCY THAT HAVE BEEN
- 5 ACHIEVED BY LARGE COMPANIES IN CALIFORNIA. FIRST,
- 6 PACIFIC BELL A FEW YEARS AGO SWITCHED THEIR
- 7 BILLING TO DOUBLE-SIDED. AND THAT RESULTS IN A
- 8 27-PERCENT REDUCTION IN PAPER USE AND AN \$11 AND A
- 9 HALF MILLION DECREASE IN THEIR ANNUAL POSTAGE
- 10 COST. WE CAN SEE HERE THAT THEIR SAVINGS ARE NOT
- 11 NECESSARILY FOCUSED ON A DECREASE IN DISPOSAL
- 12 FEES, BUT ON OTHER COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH DOING
- 13 BUSINESS.
- 14 COORS INSTITUTED AN EFFORT TO
- 15 LIGHTWEIGHT THEIR BEER BOTTLES, AND THAT SAVED
- 16 THEM 53 MILLION POUNDS OF GLASS. VONS, WHO IS A
- 17 WASTE REDUCTION AWARDS PROGRAM WINNER, ABOUT TWO
- 18 YEARS AGO STARTED AN EFFORT OF WHAT WE CALL
- 19 JUST-IN-TIME ORDERING WHERE THEY LOOKED AT HOW
- 20 MANY PERISHABLE PRODUCTS WERE BEING DISPOSED AND
- 21 REALIZED THEY NEEDED TO MAKE CHANGES IN THEIR
- 22 ORDERING. AND THEIR REAL COST SAVINGS WERE IN THE
- 23 VALUE OF THE PRODUCTS, NOT HAVING TO PURCHASE
- 24 PRODUCTS THAT WOULD EXPIRE AND THEN BE DISPOSED
- 25 OF. AND RUMOR HAS IT THEY'VE OVER THE LAST FEW

- 1 YEARS SAVED ABOUT \$10 MILLION.
- TARGET, WHICH IS ALSO A WRAP-OF-THE-
- 3 YEAR WINNER, HAS AN EXTENSIVE PROGRAM WITH THEIR
- 4 SUPPLIERS TO REDUCE PACKAGING.
- 5 AND, LAST, HEWLETT PACKARD, WHICH IS
- 6 ALSO A WASTE REDUCTION AWARDS WINNER AND A WRAP-
- 7 OF-THE-YEAR WINNER, HAS A 92-AND-A-HALF PERCENT
- 8 REDUCTION IN WASTE. AND A LOT OF THAT HAS COME
- 9 FROM PACKAGING REDUCTION AND REUSABLE CONTAINERS.
- 10 HOW DO WE GO ABOUT PROMOTING
- 11 RESOURCE EFFICIENCY TO THE BUSINESS SECTOR?
- 12 FIRST, WE BUILD ON OUR CURRENT EFFORTS, AND WE
- 13 WORK MORE CLOSELY WITH BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS.
- 14 WE HAVE DEVELOPED TWO OPTIONS FOR
- 15 THIS STRATEGY. THE FIRST OPTION HAS THREE
- 16 COMPONENTS. THE FIRST IS TO EXPAND DOCUMENTATION
- 17 OF THE BUSINESS SECTORS WHERE RESOURCE EFFICIENCY
- 18 HAS BEEN APPLIED. SECOND ELEMENT IS TO
- 19 INCORPORATE RESOURCE EFFICIENCY INTO OUR EXISTING
- 20 OUTREACH MATERIALS. AND THIRD IS DEVELOPING A
- 21 STRATEGY TO EFFECTIVELY PUBLICIZE RESOURCE
- 22 EFFICIENCY TO OTHER BUSINESSES. AND THIS IS WHERE
- 23 BUSINESSES ARE BUILDING ON THE EXPERIENCE OF
- 24 BUSINESSES THAT HAVE SUCCESSFULLY IMPLEMENTED
- 25 THESE TYPES OF PROGRAMS.

- 1 OPTION 2 TAKES THE ELEMENTS OF
- 2 OPTION 1 AND WE ADD AN EFFORT TO ESTABLISH AND
- 3 EXPAND PARTNERSHIPS WITH KEY CORPORATE DECISION
- 4 MAKERS, BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS, AND LOCAL
- JURISDICTIONS. AND THROUGH THESE PARTNERSHIPS, WE
- 6 WOULD PROMOTE RESOURCE EFFICIENCY TO THE BUSINESS
- 7 SECTOR.
- 8 THAT'S THE CONCLUSION OF MY
- 9 PRESENTATION. ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS?
- 10 MEMBER RELIS: NO QUESTIONS.
- 11 CHAIRMAN JONES: NO QUESTIONS. AND NO.
- 12 3, WE DON'T HAVE ANY SPEAKERS ON THIS ITEM EITHER.
- I UNDERSTAND THAT THERE IS -- THIS
- 14 IS WHAT YOU GUYS DO EVERY DAY. AND SO TO INCLUDE
- 15 THIS AS A STRATEGY, IT WOULD ADD IMPORTANCE AS TO
- 16 WHERE, YOU KNOW, JUST HOW IMPORTANT THIS IS AS A
- 17 FUNCTION OF THE WASTE PREVENTION GROUP.
- 18 THE OTHER IDEA WOULD BE -- WE HAD AN
- 19 IDEA WITHIN OUR TEAM THAT WE NEEDED TO HAVE A
- 20 FORUM WHERE WE COULD SHARE SUCCESSES AND FAILURES
- 21 IN MEETING THE 25-PERCENT DIVERSION GOALS AND HOW
- 22 WE COULD GET TO THE 50-PERCENT DIVERSION GOALS.
- 23 THAT WOULD BE AN EVENT THAT WOULD INCLUDE CITIES,
- 24 COUNTIES, JURISDICTIONS, RETAILERS, MANUFACTURERS,
- 25 ALL THE STAKEHOLDERS TO TRY TO SHARE IDEAS ON

- 1 WHERE THE SUCCESSES WOULD BE AND HOW WE COULD GET
- 2 TO A 50-PERCENT GOAL BECAUSE THERE'S NO COOKIE
- 3 CUTTER METHODS THAT I'VE EVER SEEN YET TO GET US
- 4 THERE.
- 5 I JUST DON'T KNOW THE RIGHT FORUM TO
- 6 BRING THAT EVENT ABOUT. SO -- BUT THIS -- YOU
- 7 KNOW, IT'S -- THIS IS A VERY HARD ITEM BECAUSE OF
- 8 THE FACT THAT YOU ARE DOING SO MUCH GOOD WORK WITH
- 9 A LOT OF THE ALLIANCES THAT YOU'VE COME UP WITH,
- 10 AND THE BUY RECYCLE PROGRAM, TO ME, IS ONE OF THE
- 11 MOST IMPORTANT, ESPECIALLY NOW WHERE THE MORE THAT
- 12 WE CAN EMPHASIZE BUY RECYCLE, THE MORE IT'S GOING
- 13 TO AFFECT THE MARKETS, THE MORE IT'S GOING TO
- 14 AFFECT A LOT OF THE EFFORTS THAT WE PUT INTO THIS,
- 15 AND, YOU KNOW, HOPEFULLY PEOPLE UNDERSTAND THAT.
- 16 I MEAN I DON'T THINK -- I DON'T
- 17 THINK WE'VE GOTTEN OUR MESSAGE ACROSS TO PEOPLE
- 18 YET THAT THEY NEED TO BUY THE PRODUCTS THAT WE'RE
- 19 RECOVERING AS WELL AS WE NEED TO. I DON'T KNOW.
- SEE IF MR. RELIS --
- 21 MEMBER RELIS: WELL, LET ME FIRST START
- 22 WITH CLARIFICATION. IF I LOOK AT PAGE 24 UNDER
- 23 DISCUSSION OF OPTIONS, NOW, CURRENTLY THE
- 24 EVALUATING AND REVISION OF THE BUSINESS KIT
- 25 MATERIAL WITH RESOURCE EFFICIENCY, THAT'S

- 1 SOMETHING WE'VE DONE. AND THIS IS -- AND I GUESS
- 2 I'LL ECHO THIS. WHAT WE'RE LOOKING AT IS A DEGREE
- 3 OF EFFORT HERE. WE'RE GOING BEYOND THE CURRENT
- 4 WRAP AWARDS. WE WOULD EXTEND THAT UNDER YOUR
- 5 OPTION. WE WOULD -- WE HAVE PARTNERSHIPS, BUT WE
- 6 WOULD EXPAND THOSE PARTNERSHIPS IN THE AREA OF BUY
- 7 RECYCLE. WE HAVE BUY RECYCLE. WE WOULD BE
- 8 EXPANDING THOSE UNDER THIS OPTION.
- 9 MR. ORR: LET ME JUST ANSWER --
- 10 MEMBER RELIS: NOT TALKING ABOUT AN
- 11 EITHER/OR. IF WE WEREN'T -- IF WE WERE TO REJECT
- 12 THIS OPTION, IT DOESN'T MEAN WE'RE REJECTING THE
- 13 WRAP AND ALL THE CURRENT LEVEL OF STAFF ACTIVITY;
- 14 IS THAT CORRECT?
- 15 MR. ORR: THAT'S CORRECT. WHAT THE
- 16 RESOURCE EFFICIENCY WOULD DO IS CURRENTLY I THINK
- 17 OUR BUSINESS KIT EFFORTS ARE FOCUSED ON, TO A
- 18 CERTAIN EXTENT, AVOIDED DISPOSAL COST AS OPPOSED
- 19 TO THE OTHER EFFICIENCIES THAT WE DESCRIBED IN THE
- 20 LAST TWO ITEMS.
- 21 AND SO I THINK THE FIRST THING THAT
- THIS WOULD DO IS TO HAVE US ACTUALLY MAKE RESOURCE
- 23 EFFICIENCY AS THE CENTERPIECE OF OUR BUSINESS KIT.
- 24 AND THEN WE WOULD CORRESPONDINGLY DEVELOP CASE
- 25 STUDIES FROM OUR WRAP AWARD WINNERS AND OTHER

- 1 SOURCES TO GET THAT PARTICULAR MESSAGE ACROSS.
- 2 CURRENTLY WE WOULD NOT HAVE AS MUCH
- 3 INFORMATION, SAY, AS IN THE VONS EXAMPLES WE
- 4 DESCRIBED OR THE COORS EXAMPLE OR THE HP EXAMPLE
- 5 THAT ARE REALLY LOOKING AT AN INTEGRATED APPROACH
- 6 INCLUDING BUY RECYCLE, INCLUDING THE WASTE
- 7 PREVENTION EFFORTS. SO IT BASICALLY WOULD BE TO
- 8 MAKE AN EXPLICIT CENTERPIECE OF THIS RESOURCE
- 9 EFFICIENCY MESSAGE. SO WE WOULD BE REVISING THE
- 10 MATERIALS, AND CURRENT MATERIALS DON'T HIGHLIGHT
- 11 RESOURCE EFFICIENCY IN THIS WAY.
- 12 MS. TRGOVCICH: I ALSO WANTED TO JUST
- 13 MAKE A BRIEF COMMENT TO CHAIRMAN JONES AS WELL.
- 14 THE FORUM THAT YOU WERE DEVELOPING AS YOU WERE
- 15 GIVING YOUR THOUGHT PROCESS ON HOW TO BRING THESE
- 16 EXAMPLES FORWARD, THESE SUCCESS STORIES, I THINK
- 17 UNDER EITHER OPTION 1 OR OPTION 2, THIS EXPANDED
- 18 EFFORT WOULD BRING THE BOARD THE OPPORTUNITY TO
- 19 BRING FORWARD INDIVIDUALS LIKE VONS INTO A SETTING
- 20 WHERE THEY'RE ALLOWED TO SHARE THEIR EXPERIENCE.
- 21 IT'S NOT THAT THAT COULDN'T HAPPEN OTHERWISE, BUT
- 22 IT WOULD BE A TARGET OF THE EFFORT TO BE ABLE TO
- 23 HIGHLIGHT THOSE INITIATIVES, THOSE EFFORTS, WHAT
- 24 MADE THEM WORK, WHAT WAS UNIQUE ABOUT THAT
- 25 BUSINESS' EXPERIENCE, AND WHERE IT MAY HAVE A

- 1 RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER TYPES OF BUSINESSES, HOW CAN
- 2 THAT EXPERIENCE THEN BE TRANSLATED TO OTHER
- 3 EFFORTS.
- 4 AND THAT IS SOMETHING WE CURRENTLY
- 5 DON'T DO. WE DON'T HIGHLIGHT THOSE SUCCESSES,
- 6 THOSE CASE STUDIES, PROVIDE THOSE EXAMPLES AND
- 7 EXPERIENCES. WE DO DO THAT THROUGH THE WRAP
- 8 AWARDS. WE ARE MAKING CASE STUDIES AVAILABLE, BUT
- 9 THAT IS ON A VERY LIMITED BASIS.
- 10 MEMBER RELIS: THEN LET ME JUST PURSUE
- 11 THIS BECAUSE I'M TRYING TO FIGURE OUT MYSELF.
- 12 WASTE PREVENTION IS A KEY PROVISION OF AB 939.
- 13 IT'S NO. 1 IN THE HIERARCHY. THIS SPEAKS TO THAT.
- 14 I GUESS WHAT I'M TRYING TO DETERMINE
- 15 HERE IS WE'RE IN A PROCESS OF WINNOWING DOWN AND
- 16 CLARIFYING WHAT OUR RESOURCES ARE GOING TO BE ABLE
- 17 TO AFFECT IN THREE YEARS OR THEREABOUTS. IN THIS
- 18 WRITEUP IT'S A LITTLE BIT DIFFICULT FOR ME TO --
- 19 IT STILL SEEMS A BIT CONCEPTUAL IN THAT CONTEXT OF
- THREE YEARS.
- 21 PERHAPS, AND I DON'T KNOW IF THIS
- 22 WOULD BE POSSIBLE TO DO BETWEEN NOW AND THE BOARD
- 23 MEETING, BUT I WOULD ENTERTAIN PURSUING THIS IF WE
- 24 COULD GET A LITTLE MORE CLARITY ON HOW IT MIGHT
- 25 IMPACT. IF YOU ARE SAYING IF WE DEVELOPED MORE

- 1 INFORMATION ON THE VONS AND THE THIS AND THE THAT
- 2 AND YOU COULD PUT IT IN THE CONTEXT OF WHAT YOU
- 3 THINK THAT COULD DO FOR US IN DIVERSION THROUGH
- 4 WASTE MINIMIZATION, I THINK I'D BE MORE INCLINED
- 5 TO SUPPORT IT AS A STRATEGY. IN THIS WRITEUP

IT'S

6 STILL HARD FOR ME TO GET A HANDLE ON THAT. AND

I

- 7 WONDER IF I COULD HEAR FROM STAFF JUST A RESPONSE
 - 8 TO THIS.
 - 9 MS. TRGOVCICH: WE COULD CERTAINLY

WORK

- 10 ON TRYING TO PROVIDE YOU SOME ESTIMATES IN TERMS
- OF PERCENTAGE NOT DIVERSION, BUT PREVENTION AT
- 12 OUTSET THAT THESE PARTICULAR BUSINESSES HAVE
- 13 ACHIEVED, WHAT THEIR SUCCESS -- HOW THEIR

SUCCESS

- 14 CAN BE MEASURED BOTH IN TERMS OF DOLLARS AS WELL
- 15 AS WASTE PREVENTED. AND THEN WE COULD MAYBE TAKE
- 16 A STAB AT TRANSLATING THOSE ACHIEVEMENTS OUT.

17	THINK THAT WOULD BE AN ESTIMATE, BUT I'D LIKE
TO	
18	REFER TO STAFF ON THAT.
19	MS. CRONIN: WE COULD GET SOME
ADDITI	ONAL
20	INFORMATION ON THAT. IT IS CHALLENGING IN SOME
21	RESPECTS BECAUSE I SPOKE TO VONS. AND THE \$10
22	MILLION IS A RUMOR AND NO ONE
23	MEMBER RELIS: I KNOW I'VE HEARD THE
SAME	
24 25 I	RUMOR. MS. CRONIN: WILL ADMIT TO IT. BUT

- 1 THINK WE CAN GET SOME MORE, YOU KNOW, TANGIBLE
- 2 INFORMATION.
- 3 MEMBER RELIS: I'LL TELL YOU WHY.
- 4 BECAUSE THOSE NUMBERS THAT YOU'VE LISTED HERE

ARE

5 PRETTY COMPELLING. I MEAN OBVIOUSLY IF A

PACKARD

- 6 BELL ACHIEVED WHAT THEY DID, AND THAT COULD BE
- 7 REPLICATED IN A NUMBER OF OTHER CORPORATE
- 8 CONTEXTS, THAT WOULD BE ONE OF THE BEST

DIVERSION

9 INVESTMENTS WE COULD MAKE. SO ON FACE VALUE

THAT

- 10 LOOKS QUITE GOOD.
- 11 I GUESS I'D JUST LIKE TO HEAR

MORE

12 ABOUT WHAT'S THE POTENTIAL, THE REAL POTENTIAL,

TO

13 EXTEND THIS OUT AND SEE RESULTS SIMILARLY IN

OTHER

14 SECTORS. AND SO I WOULD THEN PROPOSE THAT WE

DO

15 FORWARD THIS AS -- FOR CONSIDERATION AT THE --

FOR

- 16 THE BOARD WITH THAT CAVEAT, THAT WE GET MORE
- 17 DETAIL IF YOU COULD PROVIDE THAT.

18	MS. CRONIN:	OKAY.		
19	MS. TRGOVCICE	H: WE'LL PROVIDE THAT TO		
YOU				
20	IN ADVANCE OF THE BOAR	RD MEETING SINCE WE'RE		
21	WORKING OUT HOW THOSE	PRESENTATIONS AT THE		
MEETING				
22	ARE GOING TO OCCUR.			
23	CHAIRMAN JONE	ES: I WOULD SUPPORT WHAT		
MR.				
24	RELIS SAYS. I THINK	THAT THIS IS A VERY HARD		
TASK 25	WHEN YOU'RE SITTING T	HERE LOOKING AT TRYING TO		

- 1 DECIDE THE FUTURE OF THIS ORGANIZATION THROUGH
- 2 THESE STRATEGIES AND KNOWING THAT WE'VE ALWAYS
- 3 GOT -- I MEAN WE'VE HAD AND HAVE A GREAT WASTE
- 4 PREVENTION PROGRAM. SO TO ADD TO THAT PROGRAM
- 5 SPECIFICALLY WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO TO ENHANCE
- 6 IT, I THINK, MAKES A LOT OF SENSE.
- 7 AND I THINK IT ALSO IS PART OF THE
- 8 PROCESS OF GETTING US TO THE NEXT STEP BECAUSE MR.
- 9 RELIS BRINGS UP SOME GOOD POINTS BECAUSE OBVIOUSLY
- 10 WE'RE NOT HERE TO DESTROY THE EFFORT OF WASTE
- 11 PREVENTION. WE'RE HERE TO MAXIMIZE WHAT RESOURCES
- 12 WE HAVE AND HOW WE CAN EFFICIENTLY AND EFFECTIVELY
- 13 GAIN THAT. SO I SUPPORT THAT IF YOU CAN CALL THE
- 14 ROLL.
- 15 MS. TRGOVCICH: CAN I ASK JUST FOR SOME
- 16 CLARITY? IS THE MOTION AROUND OPTION 1 OR OPTION
- 17 2?
- 18 MEMBER RELIS: OKAY.
- 19 MS. CRONIN: DO YOU WANT TO LOOK AT THOSE
- 20 AGAIN? I CAN PUT THOSE SLIDES UP IF YOU WANT.
- 21 MEMBER RELIS: THAT'S ALL RIGHT. I THINK
- 22 I WOULD BE LOOKING AT OPTION 1. SO I'LL MOVE
- 23 OPTION 1.
- 24 THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER RELIS.
- 25 MEMBER RELIS: AYE.

- 1 THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN JONES.
- 2 CHAIRMAN JONES: AYE. THAT WILL BE MOVED
- 3 ON TO THE FULL AGENDA FOR THE BOARD MEETING AS AN
- 4 ITEM.
- 5 ALL RIGHT. AGENDA ITEM 4, AS THE
- 6 PLAYERS CHANGE PLACES, IS THE INTEGRATION OF THE
- 7 INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD'S DEPARTMENTS.
- 8 GOT TO LOVE IT.
- 9 MS. PEDERSEN: WE WALK OUR TALK. GOOD
- 10 MORNING, MR. CHAIRMAN AND MR. RELIS. MY NAME IS
- 11 SUSAN PEDERSEN. I'M THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR WITH
- 12 THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE AND THE POLICY AND ANALYSIS
- OFFICE, AND WE'RE HERE BEFORE YOU TODAY TO GO OVER
- 14 ITEM 4, WHICH COVERS STRATEGIES 14 AND 15 WITHIN
- 15 THE 50-PERCENT INITIATIVE OR EITHER REQUIRING OR
- 16 DISCLOSING OF THE TRUE COSTS OF DISPOSAL.
- 17 IN A MINUTE I'LL ASK STAFF TO GIVE
- 18 YOU SOME BACKGROUND ON THE ITEM, BUT JUST AS
- 19 CONTEXT, DEPENDING ON WHAT CONSTITUENT STAKEHOLDER
- 20 YOU ARE IN THE BUSINESS OR OUT THERE IN THE
- 21 JURISDICTIONS, IT INFLUENCES GREATLY HOW YOU MIGHT
- 22 SEE THE BENEFIT OR IMPACT OF GOING FORWARD WITH
- 23 THIS TYPE OF STRATEGY.
- 24 DUE TO THE LIMITED DETAILED INPUT
- 25 THAT WE RECEIVED THROUGH THE 50-PERCENT INITIATIVE

- 1 TO GIVE US CLEAR INSIGHT INTO THOSE BENEFITS AS
- 2 THEY MIGHT BE VIEWED BY STAKEHOLDERS, THE FOCUS OF
- 3 THIS ITEM TODAY IS TO GATHER MORE OF THAT INPUT
- 4 BEFORE THE COMMITTEE COULD MOVE ON WITH A DECISION
- 5 AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD.
- 6 SO WITH THAT, I'D LIKE TO CALL ON
- 7 MAUREEN GOODALL OF THE POLICY AND ANALYSIS OFFICE
- 8 TO GIVE A QUICK OVERVIEW OF THE ITEM TODAY.
- 9 MS. GOODALL: GOOD MORNING, MR. CHAIRMAN,
- 10 AND COMMITTEE MEMBER RELIS. MY NAME IS MAUREEN
- 11 GOODALL, AND I'M HERE BEFORE YOU TODAY TO PRESENT
- 12 ITEM NO. 4, WHICH IS CONSIDERATION OF THE
- 13 CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD'S
- 14 50-PERCENT INITIATIVE STRATEGIES 14 AND 15,
- 15 REQUIRING CHARGING OR DISCLOSING TRUE COST OF
- 16 DISPOSAL.
- 17 BRIEFLY TO GO OVER THE CONCEPTS
- 18 THEMSELVES, THE FIRST ONE REQUIRE ALL LANDFILLS TO
- 19 CHARGE THE TRUE UNSUBSIDIZED COST OF LANDFILL
- 20 DISPOSAL. CONCEPT NO. 14 REQUIRES, OF COURSE, ALL
- 21 LANDFILLS TO CHARGE RATES REFLECTIVE OF THEIR TRUE
- 22 UNSUBSIDIZED DISPOSAL COSTS. IN MANY JURISDIC-
- 23 TIONS THESE COSTS ARE SUBSIDIZED AND, THEREFORE,
- 24 THE GENERATOR DOES NOT PAY THE FULL COST DIRECTLY.
- 25 CONCEPT NO. 15 REQUIRE ALL LANDFILLS

- 1 TO DISCLOSE THE TRUE UNSUBSIDIZED COSTS OF
- 2 LANDFILL DISPOSAL. IT'S VERY SIMILAR TO 14 EXCEPT
- 3 THAT IT REOUIRES THE DISCLOSURE OF THE ACTUAL
- 4 COSTS INSTEAD OF ACTUALLY CHARGING THEM.
- 5 BOTH CONCEPTS 14 AND 15 HAVE THE
- 6 POTENTIAL TO INCREASE RECYCLING AND DIVERSION --
- 7 THE REPORTER: I'M SORRY. I DIDN'T HEAR
- 8 THOSE WORDS. COULD YOU -- JUST THE LAST FOUR OR
- 9 FIVE WORDS.
- MS. GOODALL: BOTH CONCEPTS 14 AND 15
- 11 HAVE THE POTENTIAL TO INCREASE RECYCLING AND
- 12 DIVERSION, BUT THE ACTUAL BENEFITS ARE UNCERTAIN.
- 13 THESE CONCEPTS ARE FOCUSING ON THE
- 14 CONVENTIONAL COSTS OF LANDFILL DISPOSAL. THESE
- 15 ARE COSTS SUCH AS THE ACTUAL COST OF THE LAND AND
- 16 CLOSURE COSTS. WE'RE NOT ADDRESSING THE ENVIRON-
- 17 MENTAL COSTS OF LANDFILL DISPOSAL, WHICH WOULD
- 18 INCLUDE ITEMS SUCH AS INCREASED TRAFFIC OR AIR
- 19 POLLUTION.
- 20 IMPLEMENTATION OF EITHER OF THESE
- 21 CONCEPTS WOULD REQUIRE LEGISLATION. BECAUSE OF
- THIS, IT COULD BE UP TO TWO YEARS BEFORE
- 23 IMPLEMENTATION.
- 24 THE PRIMARY OBJECTIVE OF THIS ITEM
- TODAY IS TO OBTAIN MORE SPECIFIC INPUT FROM THE

- 1 PUBLIC ON ISSUES THAT WOULD ARISE BY CHARGING OR
- 2 DISCLOSING THE TRUE COSTS OF LANDFILLING,
- 3 INCLUDING ANY POTENTIAL BENEFITS OR CONSEQUENCES
- 4 THAT MIGHT RESULT FROM IMPLEMENTATION OF EITHER OF
- 5 THESE CONCEPTS.
- 6 AT THE JANUARY MEETING OF THE BOARD,
- 7 STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS WERE APPROVED ON THE IWMB'S
- 8 INITIATIVE TO DEVELOP STRATEGIES TO MEET THE 50-
- 9 PERCENT DIVERSION MANDATE AND ASKED THAT
- 10 INDIVIDUAL ITEMS BE BROUGHT BACK TO THE MARCH
- 11 COMMITTEE MEETINGS.
- 12 CONCEPTS NO. 14 AND 15 WERE ASSIGNED
- 13 TO THE POLICY COMMITTEE AND, THEREFORE, ARE HERE
- 14 BEFORE YOU TODAY. THE BOARD HAS DONE SOME
- 15 PREVIOUS WORK IN THIS AREA. NOTHING SPECIFIC AS
- 16 THE ITEM BEFORE YOU. HOWEVER, IN 1990 THE BOARD
- 17 DID CONTRACT WITH TELLUS INSTITUTE TO PROVIDE A
- 18 DISPOSAL COST FEE REPORT AS REQUIRED BY PUBLIC
- 19 RESOURCE CODE 40600 AND RESULTED IN A REPORT
- 20 "DISPOSAL COST FEE STUDY FINAL REPORT."
- 21 THIS REPORT WAS PRIMARILY AIMED

ΑT

22 IMPLEMENTING AN ADVANCE DISPOSAL FEE, BUT DID

MAKE

THE POINT THAT CONSUMPTION PATTERNS COULD

CHANGE

24 IF THE PUBLIC WAS REQUIRED TO PAY THE ACTUAL

COST

OF DISPOSAL.

Τ	BOARD STAFF HAVE BEEN PROVIDING	
2	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE IN THE AREA OF FULL COST	
3	ACCOUNTING. FULL COST ACCOUNTING IS A METHOD OF	
4	ACCOUNTING FOR ALL MONETARY COSTS OF RESOURCES	
5	USED OR COMMITTED IN ANY GIVEN AREA AND CAN BE	
6	USED TO DETERMINE THE TRUE COST OF DISPOSAL.	
7	ALSO, OWNERS AND OPERATORS OF SOLID	
8	WASTE FACILITIES ARE REQUIRED TO DETERMINE	
CLOSURE		
9	AND POSTCLOSURE COSTS AND DEMONSTRATE TO THE	
BOARD		
10	THEIR ABILITY TO PROVIDE FOR THESE COSTS. THIS	
11	INFORMATION COULD BE USED IN DETERMINING TRUE	
COST		
12	OF LANDFILLING.	
13	THE KEY ISSUES THE BOARD MAY WANT	
TO		
14	CONSIDER ARE LISTED ON PAGE 5 OF THE ITEM OR PAGE	
15	31 OF THE PACKET. STAFF WOULD LIKE TO SUGGEST	
16	FOCUSING ON BULLETS NO. 4, 6, 7, AND 8 THIS	
17	MORNING, WHICH ARE DETERMINING BENEFITS FROM	
18	CHARGING OR DISCLOSING THE TRUE COST OF DISPOSAL,	
19	DETERMINING THE EFFECT TRUE COST DISCLOSURE HAS	
ON		
20	LOCAL JURISDICTIONS, ESPECIALLY WITH REGARD TO	
THE		

21	RECENT PASSAGE OF PROPOSITION 218 AND ITS IMPACT
22	ON THE WAY LOCAL JURISDICTIONS VIEW OR UTILIZE
23	SOLID WASTE FEES, EVALUATING HOW CHARGING
24 25 AND	DISCLOSING THE TRUE COSTS OF LANDFILL DISPOSAL WILL AFFECT THE SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL INDUSTRY,

- 1 ALSO DETERMINING IF THESE CONCEPTS COULD UNDERCUT
- OR NEGATIVELY IMPACT EXISTING BOARD MANDATES.
- 3 BEFORE YOU TODAY WE HAVE THREE
- 4 OPTIONS, AND THOSE ARE TO CONCLUDE DISCUSSION ON
- 5 THIS ISSUE BASED UPON PUBLIC INPUT RECEIVED DURING
- 6 THIS COMMITTEE MEETING; AND NO. 2 IS TO DIRECT
- 7 STAFF TO FURTHER EXAMINE AND PROVIDE INFORMATION
- 8 ON BENEFITS AND CONSEQUENCES OF DISCLOSING OR
- 9 CHARGING THE TRUE COST OF DISPOSAL; AND NO. 3 IS
- 10 TO DIRECT STAFF TO FURTHER EXAMINE AND PROVIDE
- 11 INFORMATION ON BENEFITS AND CONSEQUENCES OF ANY OR
- 12 ALL OF THE THREE STRATEGIES OUTLINED UNDER OTHER
- 13 STRATEGY OPTIONS.
- 14 THE OTHER STRATEGY OPTIONS THE BOARD
- 15 MAY WANT TO CONSIDER ARE LISTED ON PAGE 6 OR PAGE
- 16 32 OF YOUR PACKET AND INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:
- 17 EDUCATE LOCAL JURISDICTIONS OR LANDFILL OPERATORS
- 18 ABOUT FULL COST ACCOUNTING, ACTIVELY PROMOTE AND
- 19 ENCOURAGE LANDFILLS AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO
- 20 CHARGE AND/OR DISCLOSE THE TRUE UNSUBSIDIZED COST
- 21 OF LANDFILL DISPOSAL, AND ACTIVELY PROMOTE THE USE
- 22 OF FULL COST ACCOUNTING; AND, FINALLY, DIRECT
- 23 STAFF TO DETERMINE THE TRUE UNSUBSIDIZED COSTS OF
- 24 LANDFILL DISPOSAL, AND THEN MAKE THE DATA
- 25 AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC.

- 1 BECAUSE MORE PUBLIC INPUT IS NEEDED,
- 2 STAFF IS NOT MAKING A RECOMMENDATION AT THIS TIME.
- 3 AND THIS CONCLUDES MY PRESENTATION. IF YOU HAVE
- 4 ANY QUESTIONS, I'D BE HAPPY TO ADDRESS THEM.
- 5 MEMBER RELIS: NO QUESTIONS.
- 6 CHAIRMAN JONES: OKAY. WE HAVE A COUPLE
- 7 OF SPEAKERS ON THIS ITEM. THE STAFF IS ASKING,
- 8 WHEN WE TALKED ABOUT THIS ITEM, THAT PEOPLE NEED
- 9 TO COME FORWARD AND MAKE THEIR CASE BECAUSE
- 10 WE'RE -- I'M HAVING A REAL HARD TIME TRYING TO
- 11 FIGURE OUT HERE WHERE THE BENEFIT IS HERE AND WHO
- 12 BENEFITS AND WHO LOSES.
- 13 COMING FROM AN AREA THAT WENT FROM
- 14 NINETEEN NINTY-FIVE A TON TO \$83 A TON, I DIDN'T
- 15 SEE A WHOLE LOT OF RECYCLING INCREASE, BUT I DID
- 16 SEE MY TONNAGES GO UP AT THE MRF. SO THERE ARE
- 17 PARTS OF THIS THAT I WONDER ABOUT SOMETIMES AS TO
- 18 WHAT THE ISSUES ARE.
- 19 ALSO, I'M AMAZED THAT WE'VE ONLY PUT
- 20 DOWN THOSE LANDFILLS THAT ARE SUBSIDIZED. WE
- 21 PROBABLY NEED TO PUT DOWN THOSE LANDFILLS THAT ARE
- 22 SUBSIDIZING OTHER OPERATIONS WITHIN A COUNTY.
- 23 BECAUSE I THINK IT -- WHILE IT'S OKAY TO THINK
- 24 THAT THERE ARE PLENTY OF EXAMPLES WHERE OTHER FEES
- 25 ARE PART OF THE STRUCTURE TO HELP KEEP LANDFILL

- 1 RATES DOWN, IN A LOT OF HIGH VOLUME AREAS OR OTHER
- 2 AREAS WHERE THE ONLY WAY THAT THEY PAY FOR
- 3 PROGRAMS IS THROUGH THAT GATE FEE THAT IS CHARGED,
- 4 WE'VE GOT BOTH SIDES OF AN ISSUE. AND IT -- I'M
- 5 WAITING TO HEAR FROM FOLKS OUT IN THE AUDIENCE
- 6 THERE TO MAKE A CASE TO LET ME UNDERSTAND WHERE
- 7 THE BENEFIT IS HERE IF WE COME DOWN ON ONE SIDE OR
- 8 THE OTHER.
- 9 SO MR. TOM TINSLEY, COME ON DOWN.
- 10 MR. TINSLEY: MR. CHAIRMAN, YOU TOOK MOST
- 11 OF MY SPEECH.
- 12 CHAIRMAN JONES: I'M SORRY.
- 13 MR. TINSLEY: WE -- I'M REPRESENTING RCRC
- 14 ESJPA. I'M THE PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR IN GLENN
- 15 COUNTY. EACH YEAR WE THINK WE DISCLOSE THE TRUE
- 16 UNSUBSIDIZED COSTS OF LANDFILL DISPOSAL TO OUR
- 17 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BECAUSE WE PRESENT A PROGRAM
- 18 BUDGET THAT IDENTIFIES THE COST OF EVERY PROGRAM
- 19 THAT WE PROVIDE. AND THE FACT IS THAT WE
- 20 PRESENTLY SPEND ABOUT ONE-THIRD OF THAT BUDGET,
- 21 THE SOLID WASTE PORTION OF IT, ON ADMINISTRATIVE
- OVERHEAD AND DIVERSION EFFORTS, WHICH IN OUR

SMALL

- 23 COUNTY ARE NOT COST-EFFECTIVE.
- 24 WASTE DISPOSAL SUBSIDIZES DIVERSION
- 25 ACTIVITY IN GLENN COUNTY AND I SUSPECT IN MANY

- 1 OTHER RURAL JURISDICTIONS. AND IF WE WERE TO
- 2 CHARGE -- IF WE WERE TO CHARGE ONLY WHAT IT COSTS
- 3 TO BURY THE GARBAGE, WE WOULD BE UNABLE TO FUND A
- 4 LOT OF DIVERSION AND RECYCLING PROGRAMS WHICH DO
- 5 NOT PAY FOR THEMSELVES, BUT WHICH WE FEEL HAVE A
- 6 LOT OF VALUE. THEY'RE WIDELY ACCEPTED BY OUR
- 7 TAXPAYERS; AND EVEN THOUGH THE VOLUMES THAT ARE
- 8 DIVERTED AREN'T HUGE IN TERMS OF AN OVERALL STATE
- 9 TOTAL, IT'S SIGNIFICANT IN OUR -- WITHIN OUR
- 10 JURISDICTION.
- 11 IT COSTS US ACTUALLY ABOUT \$25 A TON
- 12 TO DISPOSE OF WASTE AT OUR LANDFILL. WE CHARGE
- 13 36. THE BALANCE OF IT IS OVERHEAD, REPORTING, AND
- 14 FOR SUBSIDIZING THE DIVERSION PROGRAMS. AND I
- 15 THINK FORCING SMALL OPERATORS LIKE US -- I CAN'T
- 16 SPEAK FOR EVERYONE -- BUT AT LEAST IN OUR CASE, TO
- 17 CHARGE THE TRUE COST OF DISPOSAL WOULD BE COUNTER-
- 18 PRODUCTIVE FROM A STANDPOINT OF CONSERVATION.
- 19 THANK YOU.
- 20 CHAIRMAN JONES: THANK YOU. ANY
- 21 QUESTIONS? MR. JACK MICHAEL.
- MR. MICHAEL: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN,
- 23 MR. RELIS. JACK MICHAEL AGAIN REPRESENTING LOS
- 24 ANGELES COUNTY. I REALLY FOR YEARS HAVE HAD
- 25 DIFFICULTY TRYING TO UNDERSTAND WHAT IS MEANT WHEN

- 1 PEOPLE SUGGEST THAT LANDFILLS DON'T CHARGE THE
- 2 FULL COST OF LANDFILLING. I THINK THERE HAVE BEEN
- 3 INSTANCES AND THERE ARE SITUATIONS THROUGHOUT THE
- 4 STATE WHERE POSSIBLY THE COST OF WASTE MANAGEMENT
- 5 IS SOMEHOW NOT FULLY REFLECTED IN CHARGES MADE TO
- 6 THE CUSTOMERS.
- 7 THERE'S BEEN LEGISLATION IN THE PAST
- 8 TO TRY TO DISCLOSE TO THE PUBLIC WHAT THOSE COSTS
- 9 ARE. MANY JURISDICTIONS INCLUDE FROM THEIR
- 10 PROPERTY TAX BASE PART OF THE COST OF WASTE
- 11 MANAGEMENT. I DON'T KNOW, HOWEVER, HOW THAT GETS
- 12 EVER TRANSLATED TO THE FACT THAT LANDFILL COSTS
- ARE BEING SUBSIDIZED BY ANYBODY, PARTICULARLY
- 14 GOVERNMENTS.
- 15 EVERY LANDFILL POSTS A RATE AT THE
- 16 GATE. AND IN THE CASE -- IN MANY CASES THE MYTH,
- 17 AS I WOULD CALL IT, THAT LANDFILLS SOMEHOW ARE
- 18 BEING SUBSIDIZED COMES FROM LANDFILLS THAT OPERATE
- 19 IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY, PARTICULARLY THE PUENTE
- 20 HILLS LANDFILL, WHICH HAS WHAT PEOPLE THINK ARE
- 21 RIDICULOUSLY LOW RATES, BUT ONE FORGETS THAT IT
- 22 HAS A RIDICULOUSLY HIGH VOLUME OF TRASH, AND

THAT

- 23 RESULTS IN THE ABILITY TO ACCOMPLISH MANY THINGS
- 24 SIMPLY THROUGH ECONOMY OF SCALES.
- 25 FOR YEARS PRIOR TO LEGISLATION

THAT

- 1 REQUIRED IMPOSITION OF FEES TO ASSURE OF CLOSURE
- 2 AND POSTCLOSURE AND ETC., ALWAYS INCLUDED IN THE
- 3 FEES AT THE PUENTE HILLS LANDFILL HAS BEEN MONEY
- 4 FOR CLOSURE, POSTCLOSURE, MONEY FOR REPLACEMENT
- 5 FACILITIES. ALL OF THOSE THINGS HAVE BEEN FUNDED
- 6 WHICH HAVE NOW BEEN DOUBLE FUNDED BECAUSE THE

LAWS

ASTDES

- 7 WERE PASSED AND ADDITIONAL FORMULAS AND SET
- FOR POSTCLOSURE MAINTENANCE, CLOSURE, ENVIRON-
- 9 MENTAL DAMAGE, WATER QUALITY PROBLEMS, ALL THOSE
- 10 THINGS ARE ADDED ON TOP.
- 11 AND SO IN ADDITION TO THAT, WE ALSO
- 12 PAY FOR THE WASTE BOARD TO OPERATE, WE PAY IN THE
- 13 UNINCORPORATED AREA OF THE COUNTY. ALL

OPERATORS,

14 PUBLIC AND PRIVATE, PAY 15 PERCENT OF GROSS TO

THE

- 15 COUNTY TO FINANCE GENERAL FUND PROGRAMS. SO
- 16 ACTUALLY THE LANDFILLS IN OUR COUNTY ARE

SUBSIDIZ-

- 17 ING THE OPERATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT TO THE TUNE
- 18 OF MANY MILLIONS OF DOLLARS A YEAR.
- 19 IT WAS MENTIONED THAT THERE HAD

BEEN

STUDIES DONE BEFORE. EVERYBODY SEEMS TO FORGET A

STUDY, AND I FRANKLY CAN'T REMEMBER THE DATE,

THAT

THAT

THE PRIOR WASTE BOARD DID. I BELIEVE IT WAS LIKE

1986 THAT WAS SPECIFICALLY A STUDY ON -- ENTITLED

"THE TRUE COST OF LANDFILLING." AND I DON'T KNOW
WHERE THAT REPORT HAS BEEN BURIED, BUT IT NEVER

- 1 GETS MENTIONED AND HASN'T BEEN MENTIONED SINCE
- 2 AB 939 WAS PASSED. BUT IT WAS AN EFFORT THAT WAS
- 3 DONE JOINTLY WITH PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INVOLVEMENT
- 4 AND IS TOTALLY DIFFERENT THAN, AS WAS MENTIONED,
- 5 THE TELLUS STUDY, WHICH REALLY HAD THE FOCUS OF
- 6 NOT ONLY ADVANCE DISPOSAL FEE COST BASIS, BUT
- 7 ALSO, AS MENTIONED IN THE STAFF PAPER, WAS
- 8 ORIENTED ONLY TO THE EAST COAST.
- 9 SO I WOULD STRONGLY SUGGEST THAT THE
- 10 WHOLE BASIS OF THIS -- THESE INITIATIVES ARE MYTH
- OR UNFOUNDED AND WOULD STRONGLY URGE THE COMMITTEE
- 12 TO NOT PURSUE ANY ADDITIONAL EFFORT OR WASTE ANY
- MORE RESOURCES ON TRYING TO ADDRESS THIS ISSUE.
- 14 MEMBER RELIS: MR. CHAIR, I'M PREPARED TO
- 15 MAKE A MOTION. I WOULD SAY IN THE STREAM OF
- 16 ACTIVITIES TOWARDS 50-PERCENT, STRATEGIES 14 AND
- 17 15 ARE AN EDDY. I DON'T THINK WE SHOULD PURSUE
- 18 EITHER.
- 19 CHAIRMAN JONES: I SECOND. CALL THE ROLL
- 20 PLEASE, JEANNINE.
- THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER RELIS.
- MEMBER RELIS: AYE.
- THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN JONES.
- 24 CHAIRMAN JONES: AYE. GO AHEAD AND PLACE
- 25 THOSE TWO ITEMS ON CONSENT NOT TO PURSUE.

- 1 ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH,
- 2 STAFF.
- 3 ITEM NO. 5, CONSIDERATION OF THE --
- 4 MS. LA VERGNE: GOOD MORNING, MR.
- 5 CHAIRMAN AND BOARD MEMBER RELIS. MARIE LA VERGNE,
- 6 DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR THE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE
- 7 DIVISION.
- 8 AGENDA ITEM NO. 5 COMBINES FOR YOU
- 9 THREE 50-PERCENT INITIATIVE STRATEGIES: STRATEGY
- 10 NO. 12, MORE ACTIVELY PROMOTE UNIT PRICING AMONG
- 11 CITIES AND COUNTIES; STRATEGY NO. 13 REOUIRES
- 12 CITIES AND COUNTIES TO IMPLEMENT UNIT PRICING
- 13 STRUCTURES THAT PROVIDE INCENTIVE FOR WASTE
- 14 DIVERSION; AND STRATEGY NO. 39, TO REQUIRE UNIT
- 15 PRICING FOR CITIES AND COUNTIES NOT MEETING 25-
- 16 AND/OR THE 50 PERCENT GOALS.
- 17 WITH ME TODAY TO MAKE THE STAFF
- 18 PRESENTATION IS DENNIS MEYERS, WHO'S THE CHIEF OF
- 19 THE ECONOMIC FORECASTING UNIT.
- 20 MR. MEYERS: GOOD MORNING, COMMITTEE
- 21 MEMBERS. THE THREE RECOMMENDATIONS IN THIS ITEM
- 22 REVOLVE AROUND WHAT ROLE THE BOARD WANTS TO TAKE
- 23 IN THE FUTURE CONCERNING UNIT PRICING AND
- 24 PROMOTING ITS USE IN CALIFORNIA.
- 25 THIS SUGGESTION CAME ABOUT

- 1 FUNDAMENTALLY BECAUSE UNIT PRICING WAS A VERY
- 2 EFFECTIVE MEANS TO STIMULATE SOURCE REDUCTION AND
- 3 RECYCLING. IT'S VERY WIDELY USED THROUGHOUT THE
- 4 UNITED STATES AND CANADA. NEARLY ANY TYPE OF
- 5 COMMUNITY YOU CARE TO MENTION, PROBABLY YOU COULD
- 6 FIND SOMEBODY WHO'S USING IT IN SIMILAR
- 7 CIRCUMSTANCES. THERE'S QUITE A FEW NOTABLE
- 8 COMMUNITIES, SEVERAL OF WHICH ARE IN CALIFORNIA,
- 9 THAT HAVE ADOPTED UNIT PRICING AND SEEN VERY
- 10 DRAMATIC EFFECTS ON THEIR WASTESTREAM, INCLUDING
- 11 REDUCTIONS OF THEIR WASTESTREAM BY UP TO HALF.
- 12 RECYCLING MORE THAN DOUBLING IT IN MANY DIFFERENT
- 13 CASES.
- 14 SO IT'S A VERY EFFECTIVE TOOL THAT
- 15 CAN BE USED TO STIMULATE DIVERSION PROGRAMS OF ALL
- 16 TYPES. THERE ARE ALREADY MANDATES FOR UNIT
- 17 PRICING IN COMMUNITIES IN SEVERAL OTHER STATES IN
- 18 THE COUNTRY.
- 19 THE ACTIONS THE BOARD COULD TAKE
- 20 THAT ARE RECOMMENDED HERE RANGE BETWEEN BECOMING A
- 21 BETTER OR MORE ACTIVE ADVOCATE OF UNIT PRICING IN
- 22 CALIFORNIA AND THEN THE OTHER EXTREME, ENACTING
- 23 REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS FOR UNIT PRICING IN
- 24 CALIFORNIA.
- 25 WHAT THE BOARD HAS FUNDAMENTALLY

- 1 DONE TO DATE HAS BEEN TO COLLECT INFORMATION AND
- 2 PROVIDE IT TO ANYBODY IN THE PUBLIC WHO WANTS IT,
- 3 BUT THROUGH OUR UNIT PRICING MANUAL THAT WE PUT
- 4 OUT IN 1993. WE SENT OUT SEVERAL HUNDRED COPIES
- 5 OF THIS MANUAL ALREADY. WE'VE ALSO ATTENDED OR
- 6 PUT ON WORKSHOPS AT CONFERENCES FOR WASTE
- 7 MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATIONS TO TELL THEM, PROVIDE
- 8 TECHNICAL INFORMATION ON IT, PROVIDING CONTACTS
- 9 FOR THE COMMUNITIES, AND BASICALLY INTRODUCE THE
- 10 IDEA TO THE SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMUNITY.
- 11 SO IF THE BOARD WERE TO BE MORE
- 12 ACTIVE AS A PROMOTER OR AN EDUCATOR ABOUT UNIT
- 13 PRICING, WE SHOULD FOCUS OUR EFFORTS ON THE
- 14 DECISION MAKERS IN THE LOCAL COMMUNITIES. SOLID
- 15 WASTE MANAGEMENT INDUSTRY HAS REALLY BEEN
- 16 INTRODUCED AND TOLD ABOUT THIS -- THIS TOPIC AND
- 17 THESE TECHNIQUES FOR QUITE SOME TIME NOW. SO WE
- 18 NEED TO MOVE UP THE FOOD CHAIN, IF YOU WILL, IF WE
- 19 ARE GOING TO DO MORE ADVOCACY.
- 20 THE -- AS FAR AS THE REGULATORY
- 21 REQUIREMENTS GO, OTHER THAN COLLECTING INFORMATION
- 22 ON THE IMPLEMENTATION AND LESSONS LEARNED FROM
- 23 OTHER COMMUNITIES, THE BOARD HASN'T REALLY
- 24 COLLECTED ON A REALLY BROAD BASED, SYSTEMATIC
- 25 BASIS ON WHAT THE REAL EFFECT AND EVEN THE

- 1 PERVASIVENESS OF THE UNIT PRICING IN CALIFORNIA IS
- 2 SPECIFICALLY. SO BEFORE PURSUING LEGISLATION OR
- 3 MAKING A PROPOSAL, THE BOARD MAY WANT TO COLLECT
- 4 SPECIFIC INFORMATION ON CALIFORNIA, INCLUDING HOW
- 5 MANY COMMUNITIES ARE USING IT AND WHAT TYPE OF
- 6 SYSTEMS THEY'VE GOT IN PLACE. THERE'S A VARIETY
- 7 OF DIFFERENT UNIT PRICING APPROACHES. AND WHAT IS
- 8 THE IMPACTS THAT THEY'VE SEEN IN THOSE
- 9 COMMUNITIES, AND THEN DISCUSSING ANY PROBLEMS THEY
- 10 MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH ITS USE AS WELL, WHICH ARE
- 11 VARIOUS FACTORS WE WANT TO CONSIDER.
- 12 SO GETTING TO THE 50-PERCENT
- 13 INITIATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS, NO. 12 WAS JUST MORE
- 14 ACTIVELY PROMOTE UNIT PRICING ON CITIES AND
- 15 COUNTIES, FOCUSING ON LOCAL ELECTED AND APPOINTED
- 16 OFFICIALS, TO PARTICULARLY THOSE IN COMMUNITIES
- 17 WHO ARE NOT USING UNIT PRICING OR PROVIDING REAL
- 18 INCENTIVES AT THIS POINT IN TIME. IT WOULD BE AN
- 19 EFFORT TO FOCUS THE EDUCATION IN THOSE
- 20 COMMUNITIES. SO WE WOULDN'T BE ADDRESSING PEOPLE
- 21 ALREADY USING UNIT PRICING.
- 22 AND WE'D BE DOING A -- TALKING ABOUT
- 23 A MORE DIRECT APPROACH, PROVIDING INFORMATION AND
- 24 ACTUALLY MAKING PRESENTATIONS, WRITING LETTERS,
- 25 PHONE CALLS, AND THINGS LIKE THAT, AS WELL AS

- 1 ATTENDING CONFERENCES THEY WOULD ATTEND AS OPPOSED
- 2 TO THE WASTE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCES THAT WE'VE
- 3 ALREADY ATTENDED IN THE PAST.
- 4 THIS EFFORT COULD EVEN WORK WITH
- 5 SEVERAL OTHER WASTE MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATIONS,
- 6 ORGANIZATIONS TO HELP US DECIDE WHO TO TARGET AND
- 7 WHERE TO GO OUT TO AND PROVIDE INFORMATION AND
- 8 DEVELOP MATERIALS.
- 9 THE ADVANTAGE OF THIS APPROACH IS
- 10 THAT IT DOESN'T REQUIRE LEGISLATION. IT'S FULLY
- 11 WITHIN THE BOARD'S AUTHORITY TO DO THESE
- 12 ACTIVITIES, AND IT LEAVES THE ULTIMATE DECISION TO
- 13 THE LOCAL JURISDICTIONS THEMSELVES STILL.
- 14 THE DISADVANTAGE OF THIS APPROACH
- 15 OBVIOUSLY IS THAT CERTAINLY BY PROVIDING
- 16 INFORMATION AND EDUCATION, THEY'RE NOT
- 17 SPECIFICALLY GOING TO SEE SPECIFIC RESULTS YOU CAN
- 18 MEASURE. YOU ARE GOING TO HAVE TO RELY ON PEOPLE
- 19 TO TAKE YOUR INFORMATION AND ADVICE.
- 20 THE TWO OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS ARE
- 21 THE REGULATORY APPROACHES, AND THEY ALL HAVE THE
- 22 SAME BASIC STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES. ONE BEING
- 23 THAT ONE IS -- STRENGTH BEING THAT BY A REGULATORY
- 24 REQUIREMENT, YOU'D PROBABLY HAVE A GREATER
- 25 ASSURANCE OF PEOPLE MAKING A SWITCH AND HAVING AN

- 1 IMPACT ON THE WASTESTREAM ULTIMATELY.
- ON THE DOWNSIDE, IT WOULD REQUIRE
- 3 LEGISLATION. THERE'S NOTHING IN STATUTE. SO OUR
- 4 ABILITY TO GET LEGISLATION ENACTED AND THEN
- 5 IMPLEMENTED BY THE YEAR 2000 COULD BE IN QUESTION.
- 6 IT WOULD ALSO REQUIRE ADDITIONAL WORK IN THAT ANY
- 7 REQUIREMENT YOU MIGHT WANT TO ENACT PROBABLY WOULD
- 8 MOST LIKELY HAVE TO HAVE SOME EXCEPTIONS ALLOWED
- 9 TO CERTAIN COMMUNITIES, THAT THIS WAS JUST NOT A
- 10 PRACTICAL SOLUTION.
- 11 AND THERE'S A VARIETY OF CRITERIA OR
- 12 SITUATIONS THAT DICTATE WHETHER IT'S PRACTICAL OR
- 13 NOT, INCLUDING WHETHER THEY MET THEIR GOALS
- 14 ALREADY OR NOT, WHETHER THE SYSTEM THEY'VE ALREADY
- 15 IMPLEMENTED IS SUITABLE OR THERE'S DEMAND FOR
- 16 MATERIALS AND SO FORTH. SO THUS, WE'D HAVE TO
- 17 ENACT A SYSTEM FOR ACCEPTING AND PROCESSING
- 18 APPLICATIONS FOR EXEMPTIONS, WHICH WOULD BE
- 19 ADDITIONAL WORKLOAD FOR THE BOARD AND ALSO WORK-
- 20 LOAD FOR THE COMMUNITIES WHO WOULD HAVE TO PROVE
- 21 THIS WASN'T APPLICABLE TO THEM, SO WE'RE TALKING
- 22 ADDITIONAL WORKLOAD THERE.
- NOW, SPECIFICALLY THE TWO SPECIFIC
- 24 RECOMMENDATIONS, NO. 13 REQUIRES CITIES AND
- 25 COUNTIES TO IMPLEMENT UNIT PRICING STRUCTURES

- 1 DIFFERS FROM ITEM 39, WHICH IS REQUIRES UNIT
- 2 PRICING FOR CITIES AND COUNTIES THAT DON'T MEET
- 3 THE DIVERSION GOALS. ITEM 13, FIRST, WOULD HAVE
- 4 OBVIOUSLY THE MOST SIGNIFICANT IMMEDIATE IMPACT,
- 5 BUT IT WOULD ALSO AFFECT A GREAT NUMBER OF

JURIS-

- 6 DICTIONS, SOME OF WHICH WILL BE MEETING THEIR
- 7 DIVERSION GOALS AND THIS MIGHT BE AN UNNECESSARY
- 8 STEP FOR THEM.
- 9 ITEM 39 WOULD REQUIRE PEOPLE

WHO DID

- 10 NOT MEET THE GOALS TO IMPLEMENT UNIT PRICING, AND
- 11 THIS WOULD REQUIRE A STEP OF DEFINING EXACTLY WHAT
- 12 WE MEANT BY NOT MEETING THE GOALS. AND THERE'S A
- 13 VARIETY OF CRITERIA IN YOUR ITEM ABOUT -- SUCH AS
- 14 WHICH YEAR DOES IT APPLY TO AND SO ON AND SO
- 15 FORTH. SO THERE WILL BE SOME FURTHER

DECISION-

16 MAKING AND DETAILING OF THIS PROPOSAL BEFORE

IT

- 17 COULD BE ENACTED.
- THE ADVANTAGES OF THIS IS THAT

FOR

19 JURISDICTIONS THAT MAY NOT BE MAKING

ADEQUATE

20 PROGRESS, THIS MAY BE AN ADDITIONAL

INCENTIVE AND

21 WOULD GIVE THEM MORE LEAD-TIME TO IMPLEMENT

THIS

22 ITEM, AS IT PROBABLY WOULDN'T BE IMPLEMENTED

TILL

23 AFTER THE YEAR 2000, AT LEAST THE

REQUIREMENT

- 24 PROBABLY WOULDN'T BE APPLIED UNTIL THEN.
- THE DISADVANTAGE OF THIS

APPROACH IS

- 1 THAT FOR THE FEW JURISDICTIONS THAT MAY NOT MAKE
 - 2 IT TO THE YEAR 2000 GOAL, THIS COULD JUST BE
- 3 ANOTHER BURDEN TO THEM AS WELL IN ADDITION

TO WHAT

- 4 THEY'RE ALREADY TRYING TO DO.
- 5 SO AT THIS POINT STAFF IS
- 6 RECOMMENDING A SORT OF TWO-TRACK APPROACH TO THESE
- 7 RECOMMENDATIONS. ONE IS THAT THE BOARD PURSUE OR
- 8 IMPLEMENT AN INCREASED ADVOCACY ROLE WHILE AT THE
- 9 SAME TIME GATHERING INFORMATION AND STILL
- 10 CONSIDERING IN THE FUTURE THE REGULATORY
- 11 APPROACHES, PARTICULARLY IF WE SEE THAT

PROGRESS

- 12 BY A NUMBER OF COMMUNITIES TOWARDS THE YEAR 2000
- GOAL IS NOT GETTING MET. AND THERE WOULD BE
- 14 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION WE NEED TO GATHER TO
- 15 FURTHER THAT DECISION AND DISCUSSION ALONG,

SUCH

SOME

- 16 AS DISCLOSING OR TALKING ABOUT HOW MANY
- 17 COMMUNITIES AREN'T MEETING THE GOALS AND FOR

WHAT	
18	REASONS AND HOW THESE REQUIREMENTS WOULD
IMPACT	
19	THOSE JURISDICTIONS.
20	ANY QUESTIONS?
21	MEMBER RELIS: NO QUESTIONS. JUST
POINT	
22	OF CLARIFICATION. HOW MANY COMMUNITIES IN
23	CALIFORNIA ARE NOW USING UNIT PRICING, TO
THE BE	ST
24 25 OUR	OF OUR KNOWLEDGE? IS THERE ANY NUMBER? MR. MEYERS: WELL, THAT'S PART OF

- 1 PROBLEM. THE SITUATION, AT LEAST OUR RECOMMENDA-
- 2 TION OF SORT OF REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS, WE REALLY
 - 3 DON'T HAVE A GOOD HANDLE AND EXACT NUMBERS.
- 4 MEMBER RELIS: I REMEMBER AT ONE OF

OUR

- 5 HEARINGS SOMEONE OFFERED -- I THOUGHT STAFF
- 6 SUGGESTED A NUMBER. AM I WRONG ON THAT?
- 7 MR. MEYERS: I'VE NEVER OFFERED A

NUMBER.

- 8 I'VE NEVER HEARD ONE. AT THE TIME THE STUDY WAS
- 9 DONE, THERE WAS PROBABLY HALF A DOZEN NOTABLE
- 10 COMMUNITIES IN CALIFORNIA THAT WE KNEW OF HAD UNIT
- 11 PRICING. GLENDALE, PASADENA, BERKELEY ARE AMONG
- 12 THOSE. QUITE A FEW OTHERS HAVE COME ALONG SINCE
- 13 THEN AS WELL.
- AND WE'VE NEVER HAD A PROJECT

UNDER

15 WAY TO TRACK AND SEE WHICH OF THOSE THERE ARE.

- 16 THERE'S BEEN OTHER STUDIES DONE BY THE PEOPLE
- OUTSIDE THE STATE OR OUTSIDE OF THE BOARD ANYWAY
- 18 TO TRY TO ESTIMATE THOSE NUMBERS. AND I'VE HEARD,
- 19 AND I CAN'T VOUCH FOR THEM BECAUSE I HAVEN'T READ
- THE STUDIES, UPWARDS OF 40 PERCENT OF THE
- 21 WASTESTREAM MAY ALREADY BE ON SOME FORM OF

UNIT

- 22 PRICING SYSTEM ALREADY.
- 23 CHAIRMAN JONES: WE HAVE TWO

SPEAKER

24 SLIPS. MR. TOM TINSLEY FROM GLENN COUNTY. 25 MR. TINSLEY: MOST OF THE -- AGAIN, FROM

- 1 THE RURAL COUNTY PERSPECTIVE, MOST OF US DO
- 2 RECEIVE THE MAJORITY OF OUR WASTE FROM SELF-
- 3 HAULERS. AND SOME COUNTIES RECEIVE UP TO 80
- 4 PERCENT IN THIS FASHION. IN ESSENCE, THEY'RE UNIT
- 5 PRICING ALREADY. THEY CHARGE BY THE TON OR BY THE
- 6 PICKUP LOAD OR BY THE CAN AT THEIR TRANSFER
- 7 STATION OR LANDFILL.
- 8 AND I DON'T THINK FROM THE RURAL
- 9 PERSPECTIVE I SEE MUCH NEED TO IMPLEMENT A TOP
- 10 HEAVY PRICING STRUCTURE AS A CONSERVATION MEASURE.
- 11 I THINK IT WOULD, AGAIN, ACHIEVE THE OPPOSITE
- 12 EFFECT. YOU'D WIND UP WITH GARBAGE IN THE ROAD
- 13 DITCHES AND IN THE WOODS AND ON THE PRIVATE
- 14 PROPERTIES.
- 15 I DO THINK THAT IN SOME -- IN MOST
- 16 INSTANCES WHERE WE HAVE A PRIVATE HAULER, THE
- 17 RATES ARE STRUCTURED TO PROVIDE A REALISTIC
- 18 INCREMENTAL COST OF COLLECTING REFUSE AT LEAST
- 19 FROM RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMERS. ONCE YOU'VE GONE OUT
- 20 TO A SITE TO PICK UP A CAN, IT DOESN'T COST YOU
- 21 THAT MUCH TO PICK UP A SECOND CAN AT THE SAME
- 22 SITE.
- 23 AND I WOULD BE -- AGAIN, IT'S A

TRUE

- 24 COST OF DISPOSAL OR TRUE COST OF WASTE MANAGEMENT
- 25 TO SAY THAT THE SECOND CAN OR MULTIPLE CANS

SHOULD

- 1 BE CHARGED AT A LOWER RATE. I WOULDN'T HAVE ANY
- 2 OBJECTION TO ADVOCACY OF A UNIT PRICING STRUCTURE
- 3 AS LONG AS THAT WAS, YOU MIGHT SAY, A DECLINING
- 4 BLOCK RATE WHERE THE TRUE INCREMENTAL COST OF
- 5 COLLECTION WERE REFLECTED IN THE RATE. IN OTHER
- 6 WORDS, DON'T CHARGE MORE FOR THE SECOND CAN AS A
- 7 MEANS OF IMPLEMENTING OR ENCOURAGING CONSER-
- 8 VATION.
- 9 MEMBER RELIS: WHAT WOULD YOU DO THEN?
- 10 I'M NOT CLEAR. WHAT'S YOUR VIEW OF UNIT PRICING?
- 11 MR. TINSLEY: I HAVE NO OBJECTION TO UNIT
- 12 PRICING AS LONG AS YOU WERE CHARGING, YOU MIGHT
- 13 SAY, AT A FLAT UNIT PRICE, SO MUCH PER POUND
- 14 REGARDLESS OF WHETHER IT WAS THE FIRST POUND OR
- 15 HUNDREDTH POUND. IT'S SIMILAR TO A WATER RATE,
- 16 THAT YOU PAY MORE PER GALLON IF YOU USE FEWER
- 17 GALLONS. IT'S KIND -- THAT'S A BACKWARD SITUATION
- 18 THAT DOESN'T ENCOURAGE CONSERVATION, BUT I WOULD
- 19 SAY IF YOU ARE GOING TO CHARGE BY THE UNIT,
- 20 WHETHER UNIT BE A CAN, OR CHARGE AT A REALISTIC
- 21 COST OF MANAGING THAT UNIT. AND IF THE SECOND CAN
- 22 DOESN'T COST YOU AS MUCH TO COLLECT AS THE FIRST
- 23 CAN, THEN CHARGE A LOWER RATE FOR THE SECOND CAN.
- 24 MEMBER RELIS: INTERESTING APPROACH.
- THANK YOU.

- 1 CHAIRMAN JONES: MR. JACK MICHAEL.
- 2 MR. MICHAEL: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN,
- 3 MR. RELIS. JACK MICHAEL, REPRESENTING LOS ANGELES
- 4 COUNTY. WHAT I HAVE TO SAY HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH
- 5 THE CONCEPT OF UNIT PRICING. I WOULD LIKE TO
- 6 ADDRESS THE CONCEPTS AS I SEE THEM HERE.
- 7 RECOGNIZING THAT UNIT PRICING, I THINK, IS A VERY
- 8 INDIVIDUAL COMMUNITY ISSUE IN TERMS OF OTHER
- 9 PROGRAMS THAT ARE BEING IMPLEMENTED, OTHER ISSUES
- 10 THAT EXIST IN THOSE COMMUNITIES, AND HOW THE
- 11 COMMUNITY BEST DETERMINES THAT THEY CAN MEET THE
- 12 MANDATE. THAT WAS ALL ABOUT A WHOLE PLANNING
- 13 PROCESS THAT LOCAL GOVERNMENTS WENT THROUGH AND
- 14 CONTINUE TO GO THROUGH IN TERMS OF REVIEWS AND
- 15 HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY TO MAKE AMENDMENTS TO THEIR
- 16 PROGRAMS THAT THEY FIND NECESSARY TO MEET THE
- 17 MANDATES.
- 18 SO ADDRESSING JUST THE CONCEPTS AS I
- 19 UNDERSTAND THEM HERE, I WOULD BE OPPOSED TO ANY
- 20 REGULATORY PROCESS THAT WOULD REQUIRE CITIES AND
- 21 COUNTIES TO IMPLEMENT UNIT PRICING. THE ISSUE AS
- 22 TO WHETHER TO REQUIRE THAT FOR THOSE COMMUNITIES
- 23 THAT DON'T MEET THE 25 OR 50 PERCENT, AGAIN I
- 24 DON'T THINK THE REGULATORY APPROACH IS WHAT OUGHT
- TO BE DONE ON THIS ISSUE.

1 CLEARLY THE PUBLIC INFORMATION 2 ASPECTS THAT HAVE ALREADY BEEN PROVIDED BY THE BOARD SHOULD BE CONTINUED. ANY ADDITIONAL SHARING 3 4 OF INFORMATION THAT COMES ABOUT AS COMMUNITIES 5 EITHER IMPLEMENT OR FIND DIFFICULTIES IN IMPLEMENTING UNIT PRICING SHOULD BE SHARED, AS I 6 7 THINK THE GENERAL PUBLIC EDUCATION PROGRAM OF THE 8 BOARD PROVIDES. TO ACTIVELY PURSUE ADDITIONAL 9 COMMUNICATIONS WITH DECISION MAKERS, I THINK, IS 10 MAYBE A LITTLE -- I DON'T KNOW IF I WOULD SAY MISPLACED, BUT IT WOULD SUGGEST THAT SOMEHOW 11 12 COMMUNITIES HAVEN'T BEEN EFFECTIVE IN -- STAFF AND 13 COMMUNITIES HAVEN'T BEEN EFFECTIVE IN COMMUNICAT-14 ING TO THEIR DECISION MAKERS. AND I'M NOT SURE 15 THAT THE WASTE BOARD OR ITS STAFF CAN BE ANY MORE EFFECTIVE IN DOING THAT. IN FACT, PROBABLY 16 17 EXPERIENCE WOULD SHOW THAT THERE MAYBE IS MORE AVERSION FOR LOCAL ELECTED OFFICIALS TO LISTEN TO 18 19 STATE STAFF THAN THEIR OWN STAFF. 2.0 SO I THINK CONTINUING WHAT THE BOARD'S DONE FROM A PUBLIC EDUCATION STANDPOINT IS 21 WHAT OUGHT TO BE DONE, AND THE PURSUIT OF THESE 2.2 2.3 THREE CONCEPTS AS SET FORTH, I DON'T BELIEVE, IS

CHAIRMAN JONES: MR. RELIS.

24

25

NECESSARY. THANK YOU.

- 1 MEMBER RELIS: MR. CHAIR, I'D OFFER A
- 2 RECOMMENDATION.
- 3 CHAIRMAN JONES: ONE CAME UP. I'M SORRY.
- 4 EXCUSE ME. MR. CHARLES WHITE. I'M SORRY. CAME
- 5 IN LATE.
- 6 MR. WHITE: I WON'T TAKE MUCH OF YOUR
- 7 TIME. CHARLES WHITE WITH WASTE MANAGEMENT. I
- 8 WOULD JUST LIKE TO ECHO WHAT MR. MICHAEL SAID IS
- 9 THAT WE BASICALLY BELIEVE THIS OUGHT TO BE A LOCAL
- 10 PREROGATIVE ON MAKING A DECISION WHERE YOU GO WITH
- 11 VARIABLE CAN RATES. IT'S ONE OF MANY TOOLS THAT
- 12 CAN BE USED TO MEET DIVERSION GOALS. AND I THINK
- 13 WE WOULD BE VERY RELUCTANT TO SUPPORT ANY
- 14 INITIATIVE THAT WOULD TRY IMPOSE THROUGH THE HEAVY
- 15 HAND OF STATE GOVERNMENT ANY KIND OF REQUIREMENT
- 16 ON LOCAL JURISDICTIONS TO CHOOSE THIS OR BE
- 17 REQUIRED TO USE A VARIABLE CAN PRICING OVER ANY
- 18 OTHER METHOD TO MEET THE DIVERSION GOAL.
- 19 MEMBER RELIS: MR. CHAIR, IT SEEMS TO ME
- 20 THAT THERE'S BEEN A GOOD DEAL OF RESEARCH INTO THE
- 21 VARIABLE CAN SYSTEM. AND THAT RESEARCH, I THINK,
- 22 IS COMPELLING ABOUT ITS EFFECTIVENESS. NOW, FOR
- 23 THAT REASON, I BELIEVE THAT WE SHOULD RECOMMEND
- 24 APPROVAL OF STRATEGY 12; THAT IS, PROMOTE THIS AS
- 25 AN APPROACH.

- 1 I HAVE A DIFFERENT TAKE ON 13 AND
- 2 39. I WOULD RECOMMEND WE REJECT BOTH, BUT I ALSO
- 3 WOULD ADD THAT WE MIGHT CONSIDER ADDING THE
- 4 VARIABLE CAN SYSTEM AS ONE OF OUR TOOLS OR
- 5 CHECKLISTS SHOULD WE REFINE THE GOOD FAITH EFFORT
- 6 THAT WE'RE LOOKING AT. THAT IS, I KNOW THERE'S A
- 7 LEGISLATIVE MATTER SPONSORED BY THE LEAGUE OF
- 8 CITIES RIGHT NOW THAT SPEAKS TO A BROAD NUMBER OF
- 9 ISSUES. I HAVEN'T SEEN THE LATEST LANGUAGE ON
- 10 THAT.
- 11 BUT ON THIS GOOD FAITH TEST, WE
- 12 MIGHT WANT TO CONSIDER THE USE OF A VARIABLE
- 13 SYSTEM OR A UNIT PRICING, RATHER, AS ONE OF THE
- 14 THINGS WE MIGHT LOOK AT. BUT THAT ISN'T MY --
- 15 THAT DOESN'T SPEAK TO STRATEGIES 13 AND 39.
- 16 I WOULD NOT REQUIRE THAT -- URGE
- 17 THAT WE REQUIRE THAT AT THIS TIME, BUT THAT WE
- 18 PERHAPS DIRECT STAFF TO FACTOR IT IN AS ONE OF THE
- 19 CONSIDERATIONS IN THE TOOLBOX ON GOOD FAITH
- 20 BECAUSE I THINK IT'S ACTUALLY MORE EFFECTIVE,
- 21 COULD BE MORE EFFECTIVE IN THAT PLACE.
- 22 COMMUNITIES DO VARY AND SOME MIGHT
- 23 CHOOSE NOT TO USE THIS FOR REASONS PECULIAR TO
- THEM AND TO HAVE IT MANDATED TO THEM, BUT THEY
- 25 STILL HAVE TO COMPLY WITH 939. SO THAT WOULD BE

- 1 MY TAKE. APPROVE 12, FORWARD THAT TO THE BOARD,
- 2 AND REJECT 13 AND 39.
- 3 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: MR. CHAIRMAN,
- 4 COULD I MAKE A COMMENT? I APPRECIATE YOUR
- 5 COURTESY IN ALLOWING A NON-COMMITTEE MEMBER TO
- 6 COMMENT.
- 7 I'VE LONG BEEN AN ADVOCATE OF UNIT
- 8 PRICING, AND, IN FACT, I INTRODUCED A MOTION AS A
- 9 CITY COUNCIL MEMBER, I THINK, ABOUT 1975 OR 76
- 10 THAT WE DO SO IN THE CITY OF ARCATA.
- 11 ON THE OTHER HAND, I THINK THERE'S A
- 12 COUPLE THINGS TO BE CAUTIOUS ABOUT, ESPECIALLY
- 13 COMING FROM A RURAL PERSPECTIVE. I THINK IT'S
- 14 SOMEWHAT TRUE EVERYWHERE. AND THAT IS THAT YOU
- 15 HAVE TO HAVE A VERY MAJOR CRITERIA MET BEFORE YOU
- 16 MOVE TO UNIT PRICING, AND THAT IS EXTREMELY
- 17 CONVENIENT ALTERNATIVE -- RESPONSIBLE ALTERNATIVES
- 18 BE AVAILABLE AT THE SAME TIME SO YOU'RE CREATING
- 19 INCENTIVE TO DO WHAT IS READILY AVAILABLE TO THE
- 20 PERSON; IN OTHER WORDS, RECYCLING OR WASTE
- 21 PREVENTION ACTIVITIES THAT THEY'VE BEEN WELL
- 22 EDUCATED ABOUT.
- 23 SIMPLY PUTTING UNIT PRICING IN PLACE
- 24 CAN JUST AS EASILY CREATE AN INCENTIVE FOR PEOPLE
- 25 TO DUMP THEIR GARBAGE IN SOMEBODY ELSE'S CAN, DUMP

- 1 IT IN A DITCH SOMEWHERE, JUMP IN THE CAN AND STOMP
- 2 IT DOWN A LITTLE FURTHER, OR GO BUY A TRASH
- 3 COMPACTOR, YOU KNOW. AND SO I THINK IT'S REAL
- 4 IMPORTANT TO PUT IT IN THE BALANCED PERSPECTIVE,
- 5 AND IT NEEDS TO BE PART OF AN INTEGRATED DIVERSION
- 6 PLAN, WASTE REDUCTION AND DIVERSION PLAN, IN THE
- 7 COMMUNITY AND NOT -- IT'S NOT SOMETHING IN
- 8 ISOLATION THAT REALLY IS A GREAT IDEA.
- 9 AND SO I DO THINK IT NEEDS TO BE AN
- 10 IMPORTANT PART OF OUR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND
- 11 EDUCATION PROGRAM, BUT AS A SIMPLISTIC SOLUTION
- 12 THAT YOU CAN JUST POINT BLANK SAY EVERYONE HAS TO
- 13 DO, I THINK IT HAS ITS PITFALLS.
- 14 CHAIRMAN JONES: THANK YOU, BOARD MEMBER
- 15 CHESBRO. ONE OTHER COMMENT TOO. BOARD MEMBER
- 16 CHESBRO TALKED ABOUT STOMPING DOWN ON CANS. THERE
- 17 IS A FORM OF UNIT PRICING -- I'M NOT SURE THAT
- 18 WE'RE REALLY IN AGREEMENT OR COULD COME TO
- 19 CONSENSUS OF WHAT UNIT PRICING IS. I THINK IF YOU
- 20 LOOK AT THE INDUSTRY, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT WANTED
- 21 TO RUN THEIR BUSINESS QUITE AWHILE AGO, WAS PUT
- 22 ALL OUR CAN OUT AND THERE WERE ADVANTAGES TO MORE
- 23 CANS.
- 24 I DON'T THINK THAT THAT'S THE CASE
- 25 SO MUCH ANYMORE. I THINK THAT THE CONVENIENCE OF

- 1 GOING TO AUTOMATED SYSTEMS, AUTOMATED SYSTEMS THAT
- 2 BRING THAT WASTE TO WASTE RECOVERY FACILITIES
- 3 WHERE IT'S SORTED ACHIEVE THE SAME GOALS.
- 4 AREAS THAT -- THAT GIVE INCENTIVES
- 5 FOR ONE CAN, ONE 32-GALLON CAN ON THE CURB, I WILL
- 6 TELL YOU FROM FIRSTHAND KNOWLEDGE THAT IF THOSE
- 7 WEIGHTS FOR THAT CAN RAN RIGHT AROUND 29 TO 31
- 8 POUNDS BEFORE THAT PROGRAM WAS IMPLEMENTED, AFTER
- 9 THAT PROGRAM WAS IMPLEMENTED, THEY RUN SOMEWHERE
- 10 BETWEEN 40 AND 46 POUNDS PER CAN. SO WE HAVEN'T
- 11 ACHIEVED ANYTHING. WE'VE JUST CAME UP WITH THE
- 12 TUOLUME COUNTY STOMP OR THE SEATTLE STOMP OR
- 13 WHATEVER YOU WANT TO CALL IT, AND THEN THE BURDEN
- 14 GOES ON WHOEVER THE OPERATOR IS, PUBLIC, PRIVATE,
- 15 WHATEVER.
- 16 SO MY ONLY QUESTION ABOUT THIS ITEM
- 17 AND -- IS THE ADVOCACY THAT YOU ARE DOING AT THIS
- 18 POINT HAS VALUE. THE -- BY PROMOTING MORE
- 19 ACTIVELY PROMOTING ADVOCACY, IS THERE GOING TO BE
- 20 A DIFFERENCE? CAN WE -- OR ARE WE BASICALLY

GOING

21 TO SAY THAT OUR MOST EFFECTIVE ADVOCACY ROLE

COULD

- 22 GIVE US THE EXACT SAME RESULTS THAT WE HAVE
- 23 ACHIEVED TODAY?

THERE'S NO GUARANTEES. I UNDER-STAND, DENNIS. YOU KNOW WHAT I'M SAYING? WE HAVE

- 1 AN ADVOCACY ROLE. WE SHARE INFORMATION AS WE GET
- 2 IT. IF WE PUT MORE EFFORT INTO IT, ARE WE GOING
- 3 TO GET ANYTHING MORE THAN WHAT WE'VE ALREADY GOT?
- 4 MR. MEYERS: WELL, I THINK THE CHANGE
- 5 HERE WOULD BE A CHANGE IN THE AUDIENCE BECAUSE,
- 6 YOU KNOW, WE'VE DISTRIBUTED THESE TO PROBABLY
- 7 EVERY JURISDICTION IN THE STATE, TO THE WASTE
- 8 MANAGERS, RECYCLING COORDINATORS, AND SUCH. WE GO
- 9 TO THE CRA CONFERENCES AND VARIOUS U.S. EPA
- 10 CONFERENCES THAT WASTE MANAGERS COME TO. WE'RE
- 11 REALLY TALKING ABOUT DOING SOMETHING VERY SIMILAR,
- 12 BUT TO A DIFFERENT AUDIENCE OF THE DECISION MAKERS
- 13 WHO ARE CONSIDERING WASTE MANAGEMENT ISSUES ALONG
- 14 WITH POLICE AND FIRE ISSUES, AND SO ON AND SO
- 15 FORTH.
- 16 CHAIRMAN JONES: AT THE LEAGUE AND CSAC.
- 17 MR. MEYERS: AT THE LEAGUE AND CSAC,
- 18 RIGHT. SO YOU'RE RIGHT. THERE'S NO GUARANTEES
- 19 EXCEPT WE'D BE TALKING TO A DIFFERENT CROWD OF
- 20 FOLKS WHO ARE INVOLVED IN THIS DECISION AS WELL.
- 21 IF WE ARE GOING TO DO MORE TO PROMOTE IT, I THINK
- 22 DOING MORE OF THE SAME IS TALK AND SAME PEOPLE
- 23 WE'VE BEEN TALKING TO ALREADY, JUST BE MORE.
- 24 CHAIRMAN JONES: I UNDERSTOOD. THAT
- MAKES SENSE.

- 1 MEMBER RELIS: WOULD IT BE ASSUMED, THEN,
- 2 ADDRESSING THE INFORMATION QUESTION I RAISED
- 3 EARLIER, THAT BEFORE YOU WOULD GO OUT, AND IF WE
- 4 WERE TO ADOPT THIS AND ADVOCATE IT, YOU'D WANT TO
- 5 HAVE A SENSE OF JUST HOW MANY JURISDICTIONS ARE
- 6 DOING THIS?
- 7 MR. MEYERS: OH, YES.
- 8 MEMBER RELIS: SO THAT WOULD BE IMPLIED,
- 9 THAT YOU WOULD DO THAT WORK BEFOREHAND?
- 10 MR. MEYERS: RIGHT.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: COULD I MAKE ONE
- 12 MORE POINT? ONE OF THE THINGS WE TALKED ABOUT
- 13 YESTERDAY AT LOCAL ASSISTANCE AND PLANNING IN
- 14 RELATION TO SEVERAL OF OUR AGENDA ITEMS WAS HOW
- 15 THE BOARD CAN BEST PLACE INFORMATION IN THE HANDS
- 16 OF THE LOCAL JURISDICTIONS THAT NEED THE
- 17 INFORMATION IN ORDER TO HELP THEM ACHIEVE THEIR
- 18 DIVERSION GOALS. AND I THINK THIS IS ONE OF THE
- 19 ITEMS THAT SORT OF FITS IN WITH THAT RELATIVE
- 20 TO -- I EXPECT TO COME BACK TO THE COMMITTEE
- 21 PROBABLY IN MAY SOME PROPOSALS FOR HOW WE MOVE
- FROM THE REGULATORY QUESTION IN THOSE COMMUNITIES
- 23 THAT ARE STRUGGLING TO ASSISTING THOSE

COMMUNITIES

- 24 IN ADDITION TO OUR ENFORCEMENT AND REGULATORY
- 25 PROCESS.

- 1 AND I WOULD HOPE THAT THIS WOULD BE
- 2 ONE OF THE TOOLS IN THE ARSENAL, IF YOU WILL, OR
- 3 THE TOOLBOX THAT WE WOULD SHOW THOSE PARTICULAR
- 4 JURISDICTIONS. HERE'S AN OPTION FOR YOU IF

IT'S

5 BUILT IN THAT MIGHT CREATE MORE INCENTIVES FOR

YOU

- 6 TO GET YOUR DIVERSION RATE UP.
- 7 THAT'S JUMPING THE GUN A LITTLE

BIT

- 8 ON WHAT STAFF IS GOING TO BRING BACK TO US IN
- 9 TERMS OF HOW IT WILL WORK, BUT THAT'S JUST AN
- 10 EXAMPLE OF HOW WE MIGHT DELIVER THIS IN

ADDITION

11 TO GOING TO LEAGUE AND CSAC CONFERENCES.

ACTUALLY

12 JURISDICTION BY JURISDICTION WE MAY BE ABLE TO

BE

13 PROVIDING SOME OF THESE KINDS OF TOOLS AND

MODELS

- 14 AND IDEAS, PUTTING THEM IN THE HANDS OF
- 15 COMMUNITIES HAVING THE HARDEST TIME ACHIEVING

THE

- 16 ADEQUATE DIVERSION RATES.
- 17 CHAIRMAN JONES: I DON'T HAVE ANY

PROBLEM

18 WITH THAT. THAT MAKES A LOT OF SENSE. WHAT Ι'D 19 LIKE TO FIGURE OUT IS HOW THIS MATERIAL THAT'S 20 GOING TO GO OUT IN AN ADVOCACY ROLE, DOES IT COME 21 BACK TO -- YOU KNOW, WHO DOES IT COME BACK TO SO THAT WE'RE SURE THAT WE AGREE WITH WHAT WE'RE 22 PROMOTING? BECAUSE, YOU KNOW, I MEAN I'VE SEEN --24 I'VE SEEN PROGRAMS WHERE WE PAY \$10 FOR THE FIRST 25 CAN, \$12 FOR THE SECOND CAN, \$14 FOR THE THIRD

CAN

- 1 IN AN EFFORT TO PUT A CARROT OUT THERE THAT WE
- 2 DON'T WANT THE THIRD OR THE SECOND CAN. LET'S
- 3 DIVERT MORE WASTE.
- 4 QUESTION IS IF THE COST OF DUMPING
- 5 THAT SECOND OR THIRD CAN IS \$3.30, WHO KEEPS THE
- 6 EXCESS MONEY, YOU KNOW? DOES THAT GO TO THE
- 7 HAULER? DOES IT GO TO THE JURISDICTION? WHO DOES
- 8 IT GO TO? BECAUSE WHILE THE INTENT IS GOOD TO TRY
- 9 TO PROMOTE THOSE TYPES OF THINGS, WHAT'S THE
- 10 RESULT GOING TO BE?
- 11 SO I THINK WE NEED TO TALK ABOUT HOW
- 12 WE WANT TO PROPOSE THIS ADVOCACY SO THAT IT IS
- 13 STRUCTURED IN A WAY THAT WE ALL AGREE IS FAIR TO
- 14 NOT ONLY THE HAULER, THE CITY, THE COUNTY, BUT THE
- 15 RATEPAYER. YOU KNOW, THE RATEPAYER ISN'T GOING TO
- 16 BE REAL FOND OF DOING -- OF LOOKING AT THAT
- 17 EXTREME. I THINK THERE'S -- YOU KNOW, OBVIOUSLY
- 18 IF IT IS \$10 PICK UP ONE CAN AND \$3.50 OF THAT IS
- 19 A DISPOSAL COST, AND THE SECOND CAN IS \$5, THAT'S
- 20 UNIT PRICING. IN MY MIND THAT IS UNIT PRICING
- 21 BECAUSE THERE'S NO INCENTIVE FOR THE SECOND AND
- 22 THIRD CAN. YOU ARE GOING TO PAY WHAT IT COSTS TO
- 23 DIVERT. SO SOMEHOW I DON'T HAVE A PROBLEM WITH
- 24 SUPPORTING THE ADVOCACY, BUT I DO WANT TO KNOW
- 25 WHAT WE'RE SUPPORTING. IS THAT FAIR?

- 1 MEMBER RELIS: THEN WOULD YOUR, I GUESS,
- 2 QUALIFICATION BE THAT THERE WOULD BE SOME
- 3 REPORTING BACK ON WHAT IS THIS --
- 4 CHAIRMAN JONES: MESSAGE WE'RE SENDING.
- 5 MEMBER RELIS: HOW IS IT PACKAGED SO THAT
- 6 THE COMMITTEE OR THE FULL BOARD WOULD HAVE A
- 7 CHANCE TO --
- 8 MR. MEYERS: SO YOU WANT IMPLEMENTATION
- 9 DETAILS BEFORE IT'S IMPLEMENTED?
- 10 CHAIRMAN JONES: YEAH. I'D LIKE TO KNOW
- 11 WHAT WE'RE ADVOCATING BEFORE WE ADVOCATE IT, IF
- 12 THAT'S FAIR.
- 13 MEMBER RELIS: FAIR TO ME.
- 14 CHAIRMAN JONES: OKAY. ALL RIGHT.

THEN

- 15 I'M ASSUMING THAT YOU WANT TO MAKE YOUR MOTION.
- 16 MEMBER RELIS: WE STILL -- DO I HAVE TO
- 17 STATE IT AGAIN? OKAY. MOTION IS CLEAR.
- 18 CHAIRMAN JONES: OKAY. I SECOND. CALL
- 19 THE ROLL, JEANNINE,
- THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER RELIS.
- 21 MEMBER RELIS: AYE.
- 22 THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN JONES.
- 23 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: AYE. OKAY. SO
- 24 ITEM 12 WILL GO ON THE FULL AGENDA. ITEMS 13

AND

39 WILL GO ON CONSENT AS NOT TO PURSUE.

- 1 WE ARE GOING TO TAKE A TIME-OUT AS
- 2 WE CHANGE PLAYERS. AND YET ANOTHER EXERCISE OF
- 3 THE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD.
- 4 (RECESS TAKEN.)
- 5 CHAIRMAN JONES: WE'RE BACK AND WE'RE
- 6 HAVING FUN. OKAY. ITEM NO. 6.
- 7 MS. FRIEDMAN: GOOD MORNING, CHAIRMAN
- 8 JONES AND COMMITTEE MEMBER RELIS. ITEM NO. 6 IS
- 9 CONSIDERATION OF THE CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE
- 10 MANAGEMENT BOARD'S 50-PERCENT INITIATIVE FOR THREE
- 11 STRATEGIES: STRATEGY 3, EXEMPT RURAL JURISDIC-
- 12 TIONS FROM DIVERSION PLANNING AND GOALS; STRATEGY
- 13 16, ALLOW SALES OF DIVERSION ABOVE MANDATED GOALS;
- 14 AND STRATEGY 24, ALLOW TRANSFORMATION TO COUNT FOR
- 15 MORE THAN 10-PERCENT DIVERSION OR 50-PERCENT
- 16 DIVERSION GOAL. ALL THREE OF THESE CAN BE
- 17 CHARACTERIZED AS WHO COUNTS AND WHAT COUNTS.
- 18 WITH THAT, I WILL TURN THE
- 19 PRESENTATION OVER TO PAT SCHIAVO.
- 20 MR. SCHIAVO: GOOD MORNING. AGAIN, WITH
- 21 NO. 3, EXEMPT RURAL JURISDICTIONS FROM AB 939
- 22 REQUIREMENTS. AND THE OVERALL PURPOSE OF THIS
- 23 WOULD BE TO SAVE RURAL JURISDICTIONS TIME AND
- 24 MONEY IN IMPLEMENTING PROGRAMS. THERE WOULD BE
- 25 APPROXIMATELY 128 CITIES AND COUNTIES THAT WOULD

- 1 BE IMPACTED BY THIS PROPOSAL, REPRESENTING 7
- 2 PERCENT OF THE POPULATION AND 8 PERCENT OF THE
- 3 WASTESTREAM.
- 4 EXISTING STATUTE PROHIBITS THE
- 5 EXEMPTION OF ANY JURISDICTION FROM REQUIREMENTS OF
- 6 THE LAW AT THIS TIME. STATUTE, HOWEVER, DOES
- 7 PROVIDE RURAL RELIEF IN FOUR DIFFERENT FORMS. ONE
- 8 IS PETITIONING FOR A REDUCTION. THERE'S ALSO GOOD
- 9 FAITH EFFORT. THERE'S TIME EXTENSIONS, AND
- 10 THERE'S ALSO THE FORMATION OF REGIONAL AGENCIES
- 11 THAT ARE CURRENTLY AVAILABLE RIGHT NOW IN THE
- 12 JURISDICTIONS.
- 13 THERE'S A FEW QUESTIONS OR ISSUES
- 14 REGARDING THIS PROPOSAL I'D LIKE TO MENTION.
- 15 FIRST ONE WOULD BE COULD WE STILL MEET STATEWIDE
- 16 GOALS IF IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS PROPOSAL TOOK
- 17 PLACE? AND THEORETICALLY, WE PROBABLY COULD
- 18 BECAUSE RURALS REPRESENT SUCH A SMALL AMOUNT OF
- 19 THE WASTESTREAM; HOWEVER, EXISTING STATUTE FOCUSES
- 20 ON INDIVIDUAL JURISDICTIONS ACTUALLY MEETING THE
- 21 GOAL.
- 22 ANOTHER QUESTION WOULD BE REGARDING
- 23 THE EQUITABLE TREATMENT OF JURISDICTIONS
- 24 THROUGHOUT THE STATE WITH IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS
- 25 PROPOSAL. AND ONCE THEY WERE EXEMPT FROM THIS

- 1 PROPOSAL, THEN THERE WOULD BE EQUITABLE TREATMENT.
- 2 HOWEVER, AT THIS POINT IN TIME, BECAUSE OF ALL THE
- 3 EFFORT AND TIME THAT A LOT OF JURISDICTIONS HAVE
- 4 ALREADY PUT INTO THE PROCESS OF GETTING AB 939 UP
- 5 TO SPEED, IT WOULDN'T BE CONSIDERED EQUITABLE AT
- 6 ALL.
- 7 IN ADDITION, THERE ARE ALSO URBAN
- 8 JURISDICTIONS THAT ALSO HAVE SOME OF THE SAME
- 9 CONSTRAINTS THAT RURALS DO AS WELL. AND ALSO ARE
- 10 THERE ANY ECONOMIC IMPACTS REGARDING THIS
- 11 PROPOSAL? AND FOR THOSE JURISDICTIONS THAT HAVE
- 12 NOT IMPLEMENTED ANY REQUIREMENTS OF AB 939, YES,
- 13 THERE'D DEFINITELY BE ECONOMIC BENEFITS ACCRUED.
- 14 BUT FOR THOSE WHO HAVE ALREADY MADE THE TIME AND
- 15 EFFORT TO IMPLEMENT AB 939, THERE COULD BE MAJOR
- 16 ECONOMIC NEGATIVE IMPACTS REGARDING CAPITALIZATION
- 17 THAT WAS ALREADY MADE, AS WELL AS JOB CREATION
- 18 THAT TOOK PLACE DURING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF 939.
- 19 THERE'S FOUR RECOMMENDED STRATEGY
- 20 OPTIONS THAT ARE AVAILABLE TO YOU AS WELL AS
- 21 VARIATIONS OF THESE IF YOU CHOOSE. THE FIRST IS
- 22 NOT TO PURSUE THIS CONCEPT ANY FURTHER. THE
- 23 SECOND IS TO HOLD WORKSHOPS REGARDING EXEMPTIONS,
- 24 SO A VERY FOCUSED WORKSHOP. THE THIRD IS TO HAVE
- 25 A BROADER WORKSHOP LOOKING AT THE ACTUAL RURAL

- 1 RELIEF AND EXPANDING THAT EFFORT, LOOKING FOR
- 2 CREATIVE IDEAS REGARDING RURAL RELIEF. AND FOURTH
- 3 WOULD BE JUST TO HAVE STAFF GO FORWARD AND PREPARE
- 4 A POLICY PAPER ON THIS SPECIFIC STRATEGY.
- 5 CHAIRMAN JONES: OKAY. WE -- UNDER
- 6 AGENDA ITEM 6, WE HAVE THREE STRATEGIES. AND
- 7 BECAUSE OF THE WAY THAT IT IS -- THE INTERESTS OF
- 8 EACH ONE OF THESE, I THINK, NEED TO BE HEARD
- 9 SEPARATELY, AND WE'LL DEAL WITH THAT IF THAT WOULD
- 10 BE OKAY WITH STAFF. IS THAT ALL RIGHT? OKAY.
- 11 THOSE SPEAKING -- I HAVE SIX SLIPS.
- 12 I THINK COUPLE OF THEM INDICATE OR FOUR OF THEM
- 13 INDICATE THEY WANT TO SPEAK TO STRATEGY 24. THE
- 14 OTHER COUPLE I'M NOT SURE OF. SO FROM RCRC, MR.
- 15 HEMMINGER, ARE YOU -- DO YOU WANT TO SPEAK TO THIS
- 16 ITEM?
- MR. HEMMINGER: YES, STRATEGY NO. 3,
- 18 PLEASE.
- 19 CHAIRMAN JONES: WE WOULD LOVE TO HAVE
- 20 YOU COME DOWN AND SPEAK.
- BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: MR. CHAIRMAN,
- 22 WHILE HE'S COMING UP, MAY I MAKE A COMMENT? I
- 23 JUST WANTED TO SAY THIS IS IN ADVANCE OF THE
- 24 OUTCOME OF THE COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION AND THE
- BOARD'S DECISION, THAT SHOULD THE COMMITTEE OR

THE

- 1 BOARD CHOOSE NOT TO SEEK FULL EXEMPTION, THAT THE
- 2 LOCAL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE STANDS PREPARED,
- 3 THROUGH ITS OVERALL ATTEMPT TO FOCUS LOCAL
- 4 ASSISTANCE, TO WORK ON THE QUESTION OF STREAM-
- 5 LINING RURAL ASSISTANCE IN BOTH THE REGULATORY
- 6 ASSISTANCE; IN OTHER WORDS, TRYING TO MAKE IT
- 7 EASIER FOR THEM TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE TOOLS
- 8 THAT ARE IN THE BOOK, AS WELL AS OTHER TYPES OF
- 9 TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.
- 10 AND I THINK THE MAJORITY OF THE
- 11 COMMITTEE MEMBERS, IN FACT, UNANIMOUSLY COMMITTEE
- 12 MEMBERS AT THIS POINT FEEL THAT THE BOARD'S
- 13 RESOURCES NEED TO BE MORE FOCUSED ON THE LARGER
- 14 VOLUMES, AS SEEMS TO BE THE TREND IN OUR OVERALL
- 15 GETTING TO 50 PERCENT STRATEGY, AND HAS -- LEADS
- 16 TO THE CONCLUSION THAT REDUCING THE DIFFICULTIES
- 17 THAT LOCAL -- THE RURAL JURISDICTIONS FACE IN
- 18 UTILIZING THE REDUCTION TOOLS, SUCH AS EXTENSIONS,
- 19 TIME EXTENSIONS, REDUCTIONS IN REQUIREMENTS, THOSE
- 20 SORTS OF THINGS, THAT THOSE SHOULD BE VERY HIGH
- 21 PRIORITY.
- 22 AND YESTERDAY WE HAD EVEN A NEW
- 23 SUGGESTION, AND THEY CONTINUE TO COME, WHICH WAS
- 24 OFFERED BY RCRC AND MAY BE OFFERED AGAIN TODAY
- 25 WITH REGARDS TO THE QUESTION OF REGIONALIZATION

- 1 AND WHETHER OR NOT THERE WOULD BE A WAY FOR LOCAL
- 2 JURISDICTIONS, RURAL JURISDICTIONS, TO COUNT
- 3 REGIONALLY WITHOUT HAVING A JPA IN PLACE, SOME WAY
- 4 OF STREAMLINING THE ACCOUNTING PROCESS.
- 5 AND I THINK THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS
- 6 WERE OPEN TO TAKING A LOOK AT THAT. SO PENDING
- 7 THE OUTCOME OF THIS ISSUE, I JUST WANTED TO ASSURE
- 8 THE CHAIRMAN AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS THAT WE ARE
- 9 FULLY PREPARED AS PART OF OUR COMMITTEE'S WORK TO
- 10 FOCUS ON HOW TO STREAMLINE THOSE PROCESSES AND
- 11 PROVIDE ASSISTANCE TO LOCALS.
- 12 CHAIRMAN JONES: THANK YOU.
- 13 MR. HEMMINGER: THANK YOU. MY NAME IS
- 14 JIM HEMMINGER. I'M WITH CALAVERAS COUNTY, AND I'M
- 15 SPEAKING TODAY AS A REPRESENTATIVE OF RCRC'S
- 16 ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES JPA.
- 17 NOT SURPRISINGLY, THIS ITEM -- AT
- 18 RCRC WE WENT THROUGH ALL THE DIFFERENT ITEMS, AND
- 19 THIS ONE IN PARTICULAR GOT THE MOST ATTENTION.
- 20 SPENT A LOT OF TIME DISCUSSING, FIRST OFF, WHAT
- 21 DID EXEMPTION MEAN, AND DIFFERENT OPINIONS KIND OF
- 22 COALESCED AND REACHED CONSENSUS ON THE ISSUE.
- 23 WE LOOKED AROUND. MOST OF THE RURAL
- 24 COUNTIES HAVE ACTUALLY FARED EXTREMELY WELL SINCE
- 25 THE PASSAGE OF AB 939, PARTIALLY IN CONSIDERATION

- 1 OF SOME OF THE CHANGES THAT WERE MADE, WHETHER IT
- 2 BE EXEMPTIONS OR PETITIONS FOR REDUCTION. MOST OF
- 3 THE RURAL JURISDICTIONS HAVE ALREADY MET THEIR
- 4 25-PERCENT DIVERSION REQUIREMENT. OTHERS HAVE MET
- 5 REDUCED REQUIREMENTS IF THAT WAS APPLICABLE.
- 6 MOST OF THE RURAL COUNTIES HAVE, IN
- 7 FACT, SUBMITTED THEIR SRRE'S AND OTHER PLANNING
- 8 DOCUMENTS ON SCHEDULE. THOSE FEW COUNTIES THAT
- 9 HAVEN'T ARE CURRENTLY WORKING WITH INTEGRATED
- 10 WASTE STAFF IN TRYING TO SET UP COMPLIANCE
- 11 SCHEDULES TO GET THOSE IN.
- 12 OVERALL, DESPITE SOME OF THE
- 13 CHALLENGES WE DO FACE IN THE RURAL COUNTIES, WE
- 14 FEEL WE'VE DONE WELL AND ACTUALLY ESTABLISHED A
- 15 PRETTY GOOD BASIS FOR WHAT WE HAVE ACCOMPLISHED

TO

- 16 MOVE FORWARD WITH WASTE DIVERSION.
- 17 I'M NOT GOING TO GO THROUGH THE
- 18 LETTER, WHICH CHAIRMAN JONES INDICATED WAS IN

THE

- 19 PACKAGE, BUT I COULD HIGHLIGHT A FEW POINTS AND
- 20 THEN GIVE A FEW PERSPECTIVES IN RESPONSE TO

SOME

- 21 OTHER COMMENTS WE'VE RECEIVED.
- 22 WITHOUT BELABORING THE RURAL

COUNTY

23	ISSUE, I	JUST D	O KNOW	THAT I	N THE	JPA, W	E
24	REPRESEN	TOT A TOT	'AL POP	JLATION	OF A	LITTLE	MORE
THAN 25 BUT	600,000	PEOPLE,	SMALLI	ER THAN	I A LO	r of Ci	TIES,

- 1 IN LAND AREA, IT'S ABOUT A THIRD OF CALIFORNIA.
- BUT NONETHELESS, WE HAVE MADE PROGRESS. WE'RE
- 3 PROUD OF THE PROGRESS WE'VE MADE.
- 4 AND RCRC HAS, AS AN ORGANIZATION,
- 5 NOT TAKEN A POSITION TO SUPPORT A FULL EXEMPTION
- 6 FROM AB 939. TOO MANY PEOPLE, WE'VE DONE TOO
- 7 MUCH, MADE PROGRESS. AS MENTIONED IN THE STAFF
- 8 REPORT, SOME JURISDICTIONS HAVE MADE CAPITAL
- 9 INVESTMENTS, IMPLEMENTED PROGRAMS. AND AT THIS
- 10 POINT TO GIVE A FULL EXEMPTION, WE THINK, COULD
- 11 BACKSLIDE, THROW THE BATH WATER OUT WITH THE BABY.
- 12 WE'VE MADE PROGRESS AND WE WANT TO MOVE FORWARD.
- HOWEVER, WE DO REALIZE THAT 50
- 14 PERCENT IS EXTREMELY -- IS A DAUNTING CHALLENGE.
- 15 TOO OFTEN WITH OUR LIMITED STAFF RESOURCES,
- 16 ESPECIALLY NOW THAT WE'VE GOT OUR PLANNING
- 17 DOCUMENTS IN PLACE, STARTED MANY PROGRAMS, WE'RE
- 18 LOOKING TO EXPAND PROGRAMS, WITH OUR LIMITED
- 19 STAFFING AT THIS POINT, WE DO FIND OURSELVES
- 20 CONFRONTED WITH AN EXTENSIVE AMOUNT, LET'S PUT IT
- 21 THAT WAY, OF INFORMATION AND REQUIREMENTS.
- 22 I GO THROUGH IN THE LETTER SOME
- 23 SUGGESTIONS. I WON'T GO THROUGH THEM ALL NOW.
- OUR TECHNICAL CONCERN IS THE POTENTIAL, NOW THAT
- 25 WE'VE FINALLY GOT A LOT OF OUR DOCUMENTS DONE,

- 1 FINALLY IMPLEMENTING SOME PROGRAMS, WE'RE GOING TO
- 2 START BEING FACED WITH THE NEED TO REVISE, REDO
- 3 OUR SRRE AND POSSIBLY DO NEW WASTE CHARACTERI-
- 4 ZATION STUDIES.
- 5 AT THIS POINT, GENERALLY SPEAKING,
- 6 WE DON'T FEEL WE NEED MORE DATA. IF SOME COUNTIES
- 7 DO, THEY FEEL THAT WE CAN GO AHEAD AND GET THE
- 8 DATA WE NEED. WHAT WE NEED IS TO BE ABLE TO USE
- 9 OUR TIME AND RESOURCES TO FURTHER DEVELOP, EXPAND,
- 10 AND IMPROVE PROGRAMS WE'VE ALREADY PUT IN PLACE.
- 11 WE'D CERTAINLY BE PLEASED TO WORK
- 12 WITH STAFF. SOME OF THE CHANGES WOULD REQUIRE
- 13 STATUTORY TO REDUCE SOME OF THE REPORTING,
- 14 COMPLIANCE REPORTING, WOULD REQUIRE SOME STATUTORY
- 15 CHANGES, OTHERS PROBABLY EXTENSIVE REGULATORY
- 16 CHANGES. WE'D LOVE TO WORK WITH STAFF IN HELPING
- 17 COME UP WITH THOSE.
- 18 A LOT HAS TO DO WITH ACCURACY. WE
- 19 DON'T WANT TO EXEMPT FROM AB 939, BUT SINCE WE ARE
- 20 SUCH A SMALL PORTION OF THE WASTESTREAM, MAYBE THE
- 21 MONEY WE'RE SPENDING TO GET SO ACCURATE WITH A
- 22 HALF PERCENTAGE POINT HERE OR HALF PERCENTAGE
- 23 POINT THERE ISN'T WHERE OUR TIME SHOULD BE SPENT.
- 24 IF THIS IS BEST ACHIEVED BY CALLING 50 PERCENT A
- 25 GOAL INSTEAD OF A MANDATE, THAT'S FINE.

- 1 ALTERNATIVELY, TO MAKE THE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS
- 2 COMMENSURATE WITH REALLY THE WASTE VOLUME.
- 3 WE PRESENTED THIS POSITION TO
- 4 SEVERAL DIFFERENT ORGANIZATIONS, SOME FOR COMMENT,
- 5 SOME FOR APPROVAL. CRRC GENERALLY SUPPORTS OUR
- 6 POSITION STRONGLY AND SAID IT MORE ELOQUENTLY. I
- 7 THINK CHAIRMAN CHESBRO PRETTY MUCH SUPPORTED WHAT
- 8 OUR POSITION WAS HERE. WE'VE TALKED TO CAC,
- 9 LAGTAC, AND I THINK, WITHOUT SOLICITING SUPPORT,
- 10 THOSE GROUPS HAVE CERTAINLY BEEN POSITIVE RECEIVED
- 11 TO THIS.
- 12 THERE IS A QUESTION OF EQUITY, AND
- 13 THAT'S A TOUGH ISSUE TO ADDRESS. THERE IS A
- 14 DISPROPORTIONATE COST TO RURAL COUNTIES WHEN WE DO
- 15 HAVE THE SAME PLANNING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.
- 16 ALTHOUGH WE WEREN'T THE WORST, I KNOW CALAVERAS
- 17 COUNTY, OUR ORIGINAL SRRE AND WASTE GENERATION
- 18 STUDY COST ABOUT EIGHT OR NINE BUCKS PER HOUSEHOLD
- 19 IN THE COUNTY. WE HAVE GOOD RECYCLING PROGRAMS;
- 20 WE'RE PROUD OF WHAT WE'VE DONE THERE. OUR
- 21 RECYCLING BUDGET IS TEN BUCKS PER HOUSEHOLD PER
- 22 YEAR, AND WE'RE ABLE TO DO A LOT WITH THAT. BUT
- 23 THE COST TO DO THESE STUDIES AND THESE REPORTS
- 24 WILL ACTUALLY SERVE TO IMPAIR THE EXTENT TO WHICH
- 25 WE CAN ADVANCE ON OUR PROGRAM ACHIEVEMENTS.

- 1 PRETTY MUCH APPRECIATE AND CONCUR
- 2 WITH STAFF'S REPORT WITH THE VARIOUS OPTIONS.
- 3 TRYING TO PUT RCRC PERSPECTIVE IN THOSE
- 4 CATEGORIES, I WOULD SUGGEST THAT RCRC WOULD
- 5 STRONGLY SUPPORT OPTION NO. 3, WHICH WOULD BE TO
- 6 HOLD WORKSHOPS AND WORK WITH STAFF FOR RURAL
- 7 RELIEF. AND UNLESS ANY RCRC REPRESENTATIVES HAD
- 8 SOMETHING TO ADD OR COVER WHAT I MISSED, THAT
- 9 WOULD CONCLUDE MY COMMENTS.
- 10 CHAIRMAN JONES: THANK YOU. MR. WHITE,
- 11 DID YOU WANT TO SPEAK TO THIS ONE?
- MR. WHITE: PASS.
- 13 CHAIRMAN JONES: OKAY. AND ALL THE OTHER
- ONES SHOWED STRATEGY 24. SO I THINK MR. HEMMINGER
- 15 WAS THE ONLY ONE.
- 16 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: MR. CHAIRMAN, ONE
- 17 OTHER COMMENT THAT CAME TO MIND THAT I FAILED TO
- 18 MENTION IS ONE OF THE DILEMMAS WE FACE IN THIS
- 19 PROCESS OF FIGURING OUT HOW TO STREAMLINE ALL THIS
- 20 IS THAT RURAL HAS BEEN DEFINED AS EVERYTHING FROM
- 21 ALPINE COUNTY TO PLACER COUNTY UP TO -- WHAT IS
- 22 PLACER NOW, 200 --
- 23 CHAIRMAN JONES: I THINK A HUNDRED NINETY
- 24 SOME THOUSAND RIGHT NOW.
- 25 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: AND THERE REALLY

- 1 ARE SUBSTANTIAL DIFFERENCES IN THE PROBLEMS THAT
- 2 THOSE JURISDICTIONS FACE AND WHAT THEIR NEEDS ARE.
- 3 SO IT WOULD BE MUCH EASIER IF WE WERE TALKING
- 4 ABOUT EVERYTHING UNDER A HUNDRED OR EVERYTHING
- 5 UNDER 50, I THINK, WOULD BE MUCH CLEARER WHAT
- 6 NEEDED TO BE DONE, AND WE COULD PROBABLY MAKE ONE
- 7 DECISION, ONE SET OF DECISIONS, THAT AFFECTED ALL
- 8 THE COUNTIES AND SAID HERE'S THE RULES FOR
- 9 EVERYBODY EXACTLY THE SAME.
- 10 IT'S A LITTLE BIT COMPLICATED BY THE
- 11 FACT THAT WE HAVE THAT BROAD A RANGE. AND I
- 12 THINK -- AND THAT'S PART OF WHY WE'VE BEEN AS SLOW
- 13 AS WE HAVE BEEN IN DECIDING HOW TO APPLY THESE
- 14 THINGS BECAUSE IT'S BEEN A LITTLE BIT COMPLICATED.
- 15 I DO THINK WE'VE NOW CONCLUDED AND IT DOESN'T NEED
- 16 TO BE AS COMPLICATED AS WE'VE MADE IT AND WE CAN
- 17 STREAMLINE IT. BUT ON THE OTHER HAND, I JUST
- 18 WANTED TO POINT OUT IT'S NOT AN OVERLY SIMPLISTIC
- 19 THING EITHER.
- 20 CHAIRMAN JONES: UNDERSTAND.
- 21 MEMBER RELIS: MR. CHAIR, WE READY?
- 22 CHAIRMAN JONES: WE WILL BE IN ONE
- 23 SECOND. I JUST -- THIS LETTER -- THIS PACKET FROM
- 24 RCRC, WE MENTIONED IT AT THE BEGINNING OF THE
- 25 MEETING. I'M NOT SURE IF THE CHAIRMAN HAD IT

- 1 ENTERED INTO EX PARTE. I WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT
- 2 IT'S ENTERED IN AS EX PARTE JUST FOR ALL OF US,
- 3 FOR ALL THE BOARD MEMBERS. I JUST DON'T KNOW IF
- 4 IT WAS DONE OR NOT. THERE WAS NO NOTE ON IT, AND
- 5 I DON'T WANT TO DO ANYTHING WRONG HERE.
- 6 AND I DO WANT TO ENTERTAIN A MOTION
- 7 FROM BOARD MEMBER RELIS.
- 8 MEMBER RELIS: MR. CHAIR, I'VE ALWAYS
- 9 FELT THE BOARD HAD THE KIND OF LATITUDE THAT
- 10 PEOPLE ARE SEEKING TO INTERPRET RELIEF OR TO
- 11 UNDERSTAND THE NUANCES THAT ARE UNDER -- THAT ARE
- 12 OPERABLE AT RURAL LEVELS. WE'VE MADE EXEMPTIONS
- OR REDUCTIONS, RATHER, IN -- TO ATTEST TO THAT
- 14 POINT.
- 15 SO I KNOW THERE CONTINUES TO BE
- 16 LEGISLATIVE INTEREST IN THIS AREA, BUT I ALSO
- 17 BELIEVE THAT SOMETIMES I THINK A CLOSE READING OF
- 18 AB 939 REVEALS AND OUR OPERATIONS REVEAL THAT THE
- 19 BOARD WAS VESTED WITH THE LATITUDE TO EVALUATE
- 20 DIVERSION EFFORTS AND TO MAKE PROVISIONS WHERE
- 21 CONDITIONS MADE IT INFEASIBLE, LET'S CALL IT.
- 22 SO WITH THAT, I WOULD SUGGEST
- 23 THAT -- RECOMMEND THAT WE REJECT STRATEGY NO. 3
- 24 THAT WOULD EXEMPT RURALS.
- 25 CHAIRMAN JONES: I'LL SECOND THAT WITH

- 1 JUST A REAL BRIEF COMMENT. I'M GLAD THAT RCRC
- 2 CAME FORWARD AND SAID DON'T EXEMPT RURAL COUNTIES.
- 3 AND I WILL TELL YOU WHY. A LOT OF THESE CITY
- 4 COUNCILMEN, BOARDS OF SUPERVISORS LOST ELECTIONS
- 5 BY LIVING BY THE MANDATES OF AB 939. SUPERVISOR
- 6 CHESBRO AND -- BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO AND BOARD
- 7 MEMBER RELIS, I THINK, ARE VERY COGNIZANT OF THE
- 8 EFFECT, AS ARE THE OTHER BOARD MEMBERS, WHEN THAT
- 9 MANDATE CAME DOWN FROM THE LEGISLATURE, A LOT OF
- 10 PEOPLE HAD TO BITE THE BULLET, RURAL COUNTIES HAD
- 11 TO BITE IT JUST AS HARD AS ANYBODY ELSE, AND
- 12 SOMETIMES BECAUSE OF THE NATURE OF THE POPULATION,
- 13 IT HAS A MUCH TIGHTER EFFECT ON THEM.
- 14 I THINK AB 688 AND AB 2494 WERE

REAL

- 15 POSITIVE LEGISLATIVE FIXES TO HELP MINIMIZE SOME
- OF THOSE EFFORTS. BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO AND I

HAD

- 17 A DISCUSSION WHEN THESE ITEMS WERE FIRST PLACED
- 18 INTO COMMITTEES. AND WE HAD DECIDED THEN THAT
- 19 WHEN WE DEALT WITH THE ISSUE AND IT GOT TO A

POINT

20 WHERE IT NEEDED TO GO TO LOCAL ASSISTANCE, THEN

ΙT

21 WOULD. AND YOU KNOW, I'M AN HONORABLE GUY. I

ALWAYS KEEP MY WORD. SO I THINK THAT, BY ALL

MEANS, WE WILL TRANSFER THIS OVER BECAUSE I

THINK

THE BIGGER ISSUES THAT WE NEED TO LOOK AT, AND

I'M

NOT SURE EXACTLY HOW WE ANSWER THESE THINGS, ARE

- 1 THOSE RURAL JURISDICTIONS THAT HAVE EIGHT, NINE,
- TEN, 11 LANDFILLS THAT COULD POSE A PROBLEM AND
- 3 UNDER SUBTITLE D HAVE TO BE CLOSED TO A CERTAIN
- 4 METHOD. I AM NOT AT ALL ADVOCATING THAT WE NEED
- 5 TO LESSEN THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTIONS THAT ARE
- 6 THERE AND HOW WE DO THAT, BUT THAT, TO ME, IS THE
- 7 BIGGEST ITEM FACING RURAL JURISDICTIONS IS HOW
- 8 THEY DEAL WITH THOSE LANDFILLS THAT WERE JUST PART
- 9 OF DOING BUSINESS.
- 10 THEY WERE SITED AS PER THE LAW.
- 11 THEY WERE OPERATED AS PER THE LAW. AND NOW THE
- 12 LAW CHANGED, AND IT'S GOING TO TAKE THE GENERAL
- 13 FUND AND THEN SOME TO CLOSE THEM. SO WE DO HAVE
- 14 SOME ISSUES THAT WE NEED TO DEAL WITH IN RURAL
- 15 COUNTIES. AND I DON'T THINK THE AB 939 MANDATES
- 16 ARE ONE OF THEM. I THINK THAT THE LAW HAS BEEN
- 17 TAKEN ON ON THAT BASIS, BUT WE DO DEFINITELY HAVE
- 18 SOME ISSUES WE HAVE TO TAKE CARE OF IN RURAL
- 19 COUNTIES.
- 20 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: MR. CHAIRMAN,
- 21 BEFORE YOU VOTE, CAN I ADD SOMETHING ELSE? I

JUST

- 22 WANTED TO SAY THAT I THINK ONE OF THE REASONS I
- 23 SUPPORTED BRINGING THE ISSUE OF RURAL EXEMPTION
- 24 HERE IS BECAUSE YOU HAVE SOME UNIQUE EXPERIENCE

OF 25

PROVIDING SERVICES, DIVERSION AND DISPOSAL

- 1 SERVICES AND COLLECTION SERVICES, IN RURAL
- 2 COMMUNITIES. AND THAT YOU HAVE, I THINK, QUITE A
- 3 CONTRIBUTION TO MAKE. AND JUST AS YOU WELCOME ME
- 4 HERE TODAY, I WOULD CERTAINLY ENCOURAGE YOU AND
- 5 WELCOME YOU IN OUR EFFORTS TO FURTHER EXPLORE THE
- 6 QUESTION OF RELIEF AND ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE
- 7 ACTIVELY IN THAT DISCUSSION BECAUSE I THINK YOU
- 8 HAVE A LOT TO BRING TO IT.
- 9 CHAIRMAN JONES: I APPRECIATE THAT.
- 10 THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
- JEANNINE, CAN YOU TAKE THE ROLL.
- 12 THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER RELIS.
- 13 MEMBER RELIS: AYE.
- 14 THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN JONES.
- 15 CHAIRMAN JONES: AYE. OKAY.
- 16 NO. B OF AGENDA ITEM 6. I'M SORRY.
- 17 DON'T WE HAVE TO MOVE -- CAN WE MOVE THIS
- 18 SEPARATELY, OR DO WE MOVE THE WHOLE AGENDA ITEM?
- 19 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: YOU CAN DO THEM
- 20 SEPARATELY.
- 21 CHAIRMAN JONES: I CAN DO THEM
- 22 SEPARATELY. OKAY. THEN THIS WOULD GO ON THE
- 23 CONSENT CALENDAR AS AN ITEM NOT TO PURSUE. THANK
- 24 YOU.
- MR. SCHIAVO: STRATEGY NO. 16 WOULD BE

- 1 ALLOWING CONSTITUENTS AND COUNTIES TO SELL EXCESS
- 2 DIVERSION CREDITS AND APPLY TO THOSE CITIES AND
- 3 COUNTIES ABOVE THE 25- AND 50-PERCENT MANDATE.
- 4 THE PURPOSE OF THIS PROPOSAL WOULD BE TO TRY TO
- 5 COME UP WITH A COST-EFFECTIVE METHODOLOGY FOR
- 6 THOSE WHO COULDN'T OTHERWISE MEET THE GOALS.
- 7 THIS STRATEGY AS IT IS RIGHT NOW
- 8 WOULD REQUIRE STATUTORY/REGULATORY CHANGES. AS
- 9 FAR AS WHO THE PARTICIPANTS WOULD BE, IT'S

UNKNOWN

- 10 AT THIS TIME. WOULDN'T KNOW UNTIL WE GOT THERE.
- 11 AND EXISTING STATUTE ALREADY
- 12 PROVIDES RELIEF, AS I MENTIONED IN THE LAST
- 13 PROPOSAL.
- 14 SOME QUESTIONS THAT HAVE COME TO
- 15 MIND AT THIS TIME ARE WHAT WOULD BE THE IMPACT

ON

- 16 JURISDICTIONS FOR THOSE WHO HAVE BEEN
- 17 CONSCIENTIOUSLY IMPLEMENTING PROGRAMS. THERE
- 18 COULD BE FRUSTRATION BECAUSE OF THE CHANGE IN

THE

- 19 LAW, AND THEY'RE ATTEMPTING TO MEET IT FAITHFULLY.
- 20 OTHERS MAY CONSIDER IT TO BE ANOTHER FLEXIBLE
- OPTION. JUST DEPENDS ON YOUR PERSPECTIVE.

WHAT WOULD BE THE ECONOMIC

IMPACTS?

23 AGAIN, YOU CAN GET INTO THEORETICAL ARGUMENTS

24 EITHER WAY. SOME WOULD SAY THAT IT MAKES A

LOT OF
25 ECONOMIC SENSE. OTHERS WOULD SAY NOT REALLY.
YOU

- 1 CAN GO DEEPER INTO THAT ONE IF YOU CHOOSE TO.
- 2 WHAT WOULD BE THE ADMINISTRATIVE
- 3 IMPACTS? WE'D HAVE TO DECIDE WHAT THE CURRENCY
- 4 WOULD BE, MEANING WOULD IT BE TONS, CUBIC FOOT,
- 5 DIVERSION, DISPOSAL REDUCTION. YOU CAN GO A LOT
- 6 OF DIFFERENT DIRECTIONS THAT WAY. WHAT WOULD BE
- 7 THE METHOD OF EXCHANGES? WHO WOULD TRACK THE
- 8 EXCHANGES AND WHEN? IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS
- 9 WOULDN'T NECESSARILY BE TIMELY BECAUSE IT WOULD BE
- 10 IN ARREARS OF GOAL MEASUREMENT, AND WE COULDN'T
- 11 DETERMINE THAT UNTIL TWO YEARS AFTER THE ACTUAL
- 12 GOAL YEAR.
- 13 THERE'S, AGAIN, FOUR RECOMMENDED
- 14 OPTIONS AVAILABLE TO YOU. THE FIRST ONE WOULD BE
- 15 STAFF DEVELOP A DETAILED PRESENTATION ON IMPACTS
- 16 OF GOAL MEASUREMENT. THE SECOND WOULD BE DIRECT
- 17 STAFF TO SOLICIT FURTHER INPUT FROM POTENTIALLY
- 18 AFFECTED COMMUNITIES. THE THIRD WOULD BE HAVE
- 19 STAFF JUST GO FORWARD AND PURSUE LEGISLATIVE
- 20 CHANGES. AND FOURTH WOULD BE CHOOSING NOT TO
- 21 PURSUE THIS OPTION ANY FURTHER.
- 22 CHAIRMAN JONES: ANY QUESTIONS?
- 23 MEMBER RELIS: NO.
- 24 CHAIRMAN JONES: OF MY -- OF THE FIVE
- 25 SPEAKER SLIPS ON THIS ITEM, DOES ANYBODY WANT TO

- 1 ADDRESS THIS ITEM, OR ARE WE ALL WAITING FOR THE
- 2 NEXT STRATEGY? OH, MR. WHITE.
- 3 MR. WHITE: I DO WANT TO SPEAK ON THE
- 4 NEXT ONE AS WELL. JUST THOUGHT I'D MENTION THIS
- 5 IDEA OF TRADING OFF EXCESS ABOVE 50 PERCENT, I
- 6 THINK, MERITS SOME FURTHER DISCUSSION AND SO I
- 7 WOULD URGE YOU NOT TO REJECT IT, BUT TO PERHAPS
- 8 LOOK AT IT FURTHER THROUGH SOME OF THOSE OTHER
- 9 ALTERNATIVES THE STAFF HAD PRESENTED. SO I DON'T
- 10 HAVE ANY SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS AS TO WHICH ONE.
- 11 I WOULD JUST URGE YOU NOT TO REJECT OUT OF HAND
- 12 AND MAYBE HAVE ADDITIONAL FORUMS FOR DISCUSSING
- 13 THAT CONCEPT OF A TRADE-OFF IN EXCESS OF 50
- 14 PERCENT. THANKS.
- 15 MEMBER RELIS: MR. CHAIR, IF THERE'S NO
- 16 FURTHER COMMENT FROM THE PUBLIC, I'M GOING TO
- 17 RECOMMEND THAT WE REJECT THIS OPTION. AND I DO
- 18 NOT BELIEVE IT TRANSLATES AT THIS TIME INTO SOME
- 19 UNDERSTANDABLE ACCOMPLISHMENT. I UNDERSTAND
- 20 TRADABLE CREDITS AND HOW IT WORKS OR HOW IT'S
- 21 ATTEMPTING TO WORK OUT IN THE AIR QUALITY AREA AND
- 22 THE TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT CREDITS IN LAND USE.
- 23 I THINK THIS WOULD BE WAY PREMATURE, AND I CAN'T
- 24 SEE A DIRECT BENEFIT. SO THAT'S MY
- 25 RECOMMENDATION.

- 1 CHAIRMAN JONES: OKAY. I WILL SECOND
- 2 THAT RECOMMENDATION. WITH -- AND KNOWING THAT WE
- 3 COULD BRING THIS BACK TO POLICY AT SOME TIME JUST
- 4 AS A POLICY OF WHAT, YOU KNOW, WHAT COULD WE DO IN
- 5 THE TRADING BECAUSE IT IS INTRIGUING, REGIONALIZA-
- 6 TION AT ITS BEST, BUT DO THE STAKEHOLDERS WANT TO
- 7 PLAY IN THAT ARENA. SO IT WOULD BE INTERESTING,
- 8 BUT I THINK WE WILL -- I'LL SECOND HIS MOTION NOT
- 9 TO PURSUE.
- 10 WOULD YOU PLEASE CALL FOR A VOTE.
- 11 THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER RELIS.
- MEMBER RELIS: AYE.
- 13 THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN JONES.
- 14 CHAIRMAN JONES: AYE. PUT THIS ON THE
- 15 CONSENT, PLEASE, UNDER A STRATEGY NOT TO PURSUE.
- 16 AND NOW THE THIRD -- THE 24TH
- 17 STRATEGY AND THE THIRD UNDER AGENDA ITEM NO. 6.
- 18 MR. SCHIAVO: OKAY. GO AHEAD AND PRESENT
- 19 STRATEGY NO. 24, WHICH WOULD ALLOW TRANSFORMATION
- 20 TO COUNT FOR MORE THAN 10 PERCENT. THIS STRATEGY
- 21 CAN BE MUCH GRANDER THAN THIS. IT CAN INCLUDE
- 22 BIOMASS CREDIT. IT CAN INCLUDE UNLIMITED AMOUNT
- 23 OF DIVERSION, OR COULD BE CAPPED AT DIFFERENT
- 24 LEVELS OF PERCENTAGE, SO YOU CAN GO A LOT OF
- 25 DIFFERENT DIRECTIONS WITH THIS.

- 1 TRANSFORMATION CURRENTLY IS ABOUT
- ONE MILLION TONS OF MATERIAL, AND IT -- IF WE
- 3 APPLIED IT RIGHT NOW AS FULLY AS DIVERSION CREDIT,
- 4 IT WOULD TAKE OUR STATEWIDE PERCENTAGE FROM 26 TO
- 5 28 PERCENT. SO IT WOULD BE A 2-PERCENT INCREASE
- 6 STATEWIDE. AS FAR AS THE IMPACTS ON INDIVIDUAL
- 7 JURISDICTIONS, WE CAN'T DETERMINE THAT.
- 8 MEMBER RELIS: YOU ARE REFERRING TO THE
- 9 1995 --
- MR. SCHIAVO: 1995 GOAL.
- 11 MEMBER RELIS: THAT MAY NOT BE THE
- 12 CURRENT ONE. WHERE WE ARE TODAY. JUST WANTED TO
- 13 POINT THAT OUT. CURRENTLY WE'RE INCHING TOWARDS
- 14 30, WE HOPE.
- 15 MR. SCHIAVO: BIOMASS FOR 1995 WOULD BE
- 16 SIX TO EIGHT MILLION TONS, AND THAT WOULD RAISE
- 17 STATEWIDE GOAL ACHIEVEMENT TO APPROXIMATELY 38
- 18 PERCENT. AND AGAIN, THE IMPACT OF INDIVIDUAL
- 19 JURISDICTIONS IS UNKNOWN AT THIS TIME. IT

WOULD

20 MOST LIKELY IMPACT MOST JURISDICTIONS

THROUGHOUT

- 21 THE STATE TO SOME EXTENT.
- 22 THIS PROPOSAL WOULD REQUIRE
- 23 STATUTORY AND REGULATORY CHANGES. LAST YEAR WE
- 24 DID EXTENSIVE ANALYSIS ON AB 2706, WHICH

ADDRESSED

25 SOME OF THESE ISSUES. THIS YEAR AB 878 HAS BEEN

- 1 INTRODUCED, AND WE'VE BEGUN ANALYSIS ON THAT
- 2 PROPOSAL.
- 3 AS FAR AS THE QUESTIONS REGARDING
- 4 THIS, THEY'RE MORE PHILOSOPHICAL IN NATURE. IS
- 5 THIS PROPOSAL NEEDED TO REACH GOAL ACHIEVEMENT?
- 6 THE NUMERICAL GOAL COULD BE REACHED MORE EASILY

ΙN

- 7 SOME JURISDICTIONS IF THIS WAS IMPLEMENTED. WE
- 8 ALREADY DO HAVE GOOD FAITH EFFORTS TO BE
- 9 CONSIDERED FOR GOAL ACHIEVEMENT. SO AGAIN, ALL
- 10 JURISDICTIONS WOULD NOT BE TREATED UNFAIRLY AS

FAR

11 AS GOAL ACHIEVEMENT OR BEING FINED IN THAT THEY

DO

- 12 HAVE OTHER OPTIONS.
- 13 THE IMPACT ON EXISTING HIERARCHY,
- 14 THIS STRATEGY WOULD BE SEEN AS REDEFINING
- 15 DIVERSION AND COUNTER TO THE ORIGINAL INTENT OF

AΒ

- 16 939. HOWEVER, IT COULD BE CONSIDERED A NEW
- 17 STRATEGY IN MEETING THE GOALS OF AB 939. AGAIN,
- 18 THESE ARE HIGH LEVEL PHILOSOPHICAL ISSUES.
- 19 RECOMMENDATIONS ON THIS ARE CHOOSE
- 20 NOT TO PURSUE THIS CONCEPT ANY FURTHER, DIRECT
- 21 STAFF TO PREPARE A SPECIFIC PROPOSAL REGARDING
- THIS CONCEPT, DIRECT STAFF TO CONDUCT A WORKSHOP

- 23 WITH AFFECTED PARTIES. AND FINALLY, THE LAST
- 24 RECOMMENDATION WOULD BE TO DIRECT STAFF TO

DEVELOP

25 LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE TO PURSUE THESE CHANGES.

- 1 CHAIRMAN JONES: OKAY. WE HAVE SIX
- 2 SPEAKERS ON THIS ITEM. I'M JUST GOING TO CALL
- 3 THEM OUT THE WAY I GOT THEM. BUT I HAVE A
- 4 QUESTION FOR YOU BEFORE WE CALL THE SPEAKERS IN.
- 5 THERE'S LEGISLATION NOW PENDING ON
- 6 THE TREATMENT OF THE DIVERSION.
- 7 MR. SCHIAVO: THERE'S LEGISLATION THROUGH
- 8 CORNETTE WHICH WAS INTRODUCED TO INCLUDE
- 9 TRANSFORMATION CREDITS FOR MEETING THE GOAL
- 10 ACHIEVEMENT.
- 11 CHAIRMAN JONES: OKAY. SO... OKAY. SO
- 12 NO MATTER WHAT WE DO TODAY, IT MAY GO ONE WAY OR
- 13 ANOTHER. OKAY.
- 14 WE HAVE SIX SPEAKERS. MR. CHUCK
- 15 HELGATE. I HOPE THAT'S RIGHT.
- 16 MR. HELGET: MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE
- 17 COMMITTEE, THANK YOU FOR THIS OPPORTUNITY TO
- 18 PROVIDE TESTIMONY ON THE ISSUE OF INCINERATION,
- 19 PROVIDING THEM WITH MORE THAN THE 10-PERCENT
- 20 CREDIT. I REPRESENT FORWARD INCORPORATED. WE
- 21 OPERATE A LANDFILL RECYCLING AND COMPOSTING
- 22 FACILITY NEAR THE CITIES OF STOCKTON MANTECA.
- 23 LAST YEAR FORWARD INCORPORATED
- JOINED WITH MANY OTHER SMALLER RECYCLING,
- 25 COMPOSTING, AND DISPOSAL FACILITIES THROUGHOUT THE

- 1 STATE IN OPPOSITION TO AB 2706, WHICH IS A BILL
- 2 THAT'S VERY SIMILAR TO 878 THAT YOU JUST
- 3 MENTIONED, MR. CHAIRMAN. AND THAT BILL WOULD HAVE
- 4 GRANTED FULL DIVERSION CREDIT TO INCINERATION, AND
- 5 THAT LEGISLATION FAILED DURING THE LAST SESSION.
- 6 I WILL BRIEFLY SUMMARIZE OUR
- 7 OPPOSITION AND THE REASONS FOR OUR OPPOSITION AND
- 8 AGAIN PROVIDE YOU WITH ANY ADDITIONAL WRITTEN
- 9 COMMENTS AS NECESSARY.
- 10 FIRST, WE BELIEVE THAT THE
- 11 INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD ALREADY HAS A
- 12 MECHANISM IN PLACE TO DEAL IN A REASONABLE FASHION
- 13 WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENTS THAT HAVE COMMITTED TO
- 14 INCINERATION AND HAVE FURTHER PROBLEMS WITH
- 15 AB 939.
- 16 SECONDLY, WE BELIEVE THAT FULL
- 17 DIVERSION FOR INCINERATION WILL PROVIDE
- 18 INCINERATION WITH AN UNFAIR COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE
- 19 VERSUS OUR OPERATIONS OR OPERATIONS LIKE FORWARD'S
- 20 WHICH HAVE MADE A SUBSTANTIAL INVESTMENT TO STAY
- 21 COMPETITIVE IN THE NEW ORDER CREATED BY AB 939.
- 22 IF INCINERATORS RECEIVE FULL
- 23 DIVERSION CREDIT FOR BURNING INSTEAD OF

RECYCLING

24 AS AN ADDITIONAL MARKETING TOOL, OUR

FACILITIES

25 WILL NOT BE ABLE TO COMPETE FOR WASTE OTHERWISE

- 1 DESTINED FOR RECYCLING, COMPOSTING, AND PROPER
- 2 DISPOSAL.
- 3 FURTHER, AS A RESULT OF THIS
- 4 MARKETING DISADVANTAGE, OUR BUSINESSES AND
- 5 INVESTMENTS WILL BE AT RISK AND SERIOUSLY
- 6 JEOPARDIZED BY ALLOWING INCREASED DIVERSION
- 7 CREDITS FOR UNRECYCLED WASTE BURNED IN
- 8 INCINERATORS.
- 9 FINALLY, WE'VE GOT TO SEE THE

PROOF

10 THAT INCINERATION WILL NOT CREATE UPWARD

PRESSURE

ON DISPOSAL FEES IN JURISDICTIONS THAT ARE

SOLELY

- 12 FOCUSED ON INCINERATION, PRECLUDE RECYCLING,
- 13 COMPOSTING, AND DISPOSAL FACILITIES FROM
- 14 EFFECTIVELY COMPETING IN THEIR AREAS.
- 15 THIS IS A MORE SERIOUS CONCERN AS

 ${\tt WE}$

16 ENTER THE NEW ECONOMIC ERA CREATED BY

ELECTRICAL

17 UTILITY RESTRUCTURING, AND, IN FACT, WAS AN

ISSUE

- 18 THAT WAS RAISED LAST YEAR BY THE SENATE
- 19 APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE STAFF.
- 20 I'D BE HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY

- 21 QUESTIONS. WE WOULD SUGGEST THAT YOU NOT PROCEED
- OPPORTUNITY ON THIS ISSUE, AND THANK YOU FOR THE
- TO TESTIFY.

YOU

- 24 CHAIRMAN JONES: NO QUESTIONS. THANK
- 25 VERY MUCH. JAMI AGGERS, STANISLAUS COUNTY.

- 1 MS. AGGERS: CHAIRMAN JONES AND BOARD
- 2 MEMBER RELIS OF THE COMMITTEE, I'M JAMI AGGERS,
- 3 REPRESENTING STANISLAUS COUNTY TODAY.
- 4 AS I KNOW THAT YOU ARE ALREADY
- 5 AWARE, STANISLAUS COUNTY IS VERY INTERESTED IN
- 6 THIS RECOMMENDATION BECAUSE WE HOST ONE OF THE
- 7 THREE EXISTING TRANSFORMATION FACILITIES IN THE
- 8 STATE. AS I'M SURE YOU ALSO KNOW, WE

COSPONSORED

- 9 LEGISLATION LAST YEAR, TOGETHER WITH THE
- 10 SANITATION DISTRICTS FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY,

THAT,

- 11 LIKE THIS RECOMMENDATION, WOULD HAVE PROVIDED
- 12 ADDITIONAL CREDIT FOR TRANSFORMATION.
- OUR POSITION IS VERY, VERY

SIMPLE.

- WE INVESTED VAST SUMS OF MONEY, IN EXCESS OF A
- 128
- 15 MILLION PUBLIC DOLLARS TO BE EXACT, PRIOR TO

THE

- 16 ENACTMENT OF AB 939. WHAT WE'RE LOOKING FOR IS
- Α
- 17 WAY NOT TO DERAIL 939 OR PROGRAMS WHICH ARE IN
- 18 PLACE, PARTICULARLY IN OUR NEIGHBORING
- 19 COMMUNITIES, BUT TO CONTINUE TO OPERATE AND
- 20 CO-EXIST WITH THESE THINGS.

21	ADDITIONAL CREDIT FOR OUR USERS
AS	
22	OUR COSTS CONTINUE TO SKYROCKET WILL GO A LONG
WAY	
23	TO HELPING US SURVIVE. AND WE ARE ALREADY
FEELING	
24 25 WE	THE IMPACT OF NEIGHBORING OPERATORS, SUCH AS FORWARD, WHO ARE DRIVING THEIR COST DOWN WHEN

- 1 HAVE BONDS TO REPAY AND ARE ALREADY FEELING THE
- 2 IMPACT OF NOT BEING ABLE TO COMPETE.
- 3 I DREW AN ANALOGY RECENTLY FOR A
- 4 COLLEAGUE WHOSE REGIONAL AGENCY JUST COMPLETED
- 5 CONSTRUCTION OF AN EXPENSIVE MRF THAT I THINK
- 6 DEMONSTRATES OUR POSITION VERY WELL. HERE'S THE
- 7 DEAL, I TOLD HIM. LET'S SAY THAT THIS YEAR AN
- 8 ASSEMBLY BILL PASSES. LET'S CALL IT AB 939A OR
- 9 PERHAPS AB 940. THIS BILL STILL CALLS FOR AN
- 10 ADDITIONAL 25-PERCENT DIVERSION BEYOND 1995 FOR A
- 11 TOTAL OF 50 PERCENT, BUT SAYS THAT YOU ONLY GET
- 12 10-PERCENT CREDIT FOR DIVERSION ACTIVITIES THAT
- 13 TAKE PLACE AT YOUR MRF. AND MY COLLEAGUE SAID,
- 14 "OOH. I THINK I'M FINALLY STARTING TO SEE YOUR
- 15 POINT."
- 16 CLEARLY, WE URGE YOUR SUPPORT OF
- 17 RECOMMENDATION NO. 24 AND FEEL THAT IT CAN BE
- 18 VIEWED FAVORABLY WITH RESPECT TO THE EVALUATION
- 19 CRITERIA USED BY BOARD STAFF FOR THE FOLLOWING
- 20 REASONS: FIRST IN THE AREA OF COST. THE FIRST
- 21 THING I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO NOTE HERE IS THAT
- 22 LEGISLATION HAS ALREADY PASSED THAT ALLOWS

BIOMASS

- 23 TO TAP INTO THE 10-PERCENT CREDIT TOWARD THE
- 24 50-PERCENT GOAL. SO COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH
- 25 CHANGING REGULATIONS AND THAT SORT OF THING

SHOULD

- 1 BE LOOKED AT SEPARATELY FROM THE COSTS THAT WOULD
- 2 BE INVOLVED SIMPLY TO INCREASE THE 10-PERCENT
- 3 CREDIT. AND WE THINK THE COST FOR DOING THAT
- 4 WOULD BE MINIMAL. IN FACT, IT MAY EVEN BE A
- 5 SIMPLER MATHEMATICAL EXERCISE THAN CURRENTLY
- 6 TRYING TO FIGURE OUT WHAT CONSTITUTES 10 PERCENT
- 7 IF YOU REALLY SHOULD GET THE FULL 10 PERCENT.
- 8 I WAS CURIOUS YESTERDAY AS I WAS
- 9 TRYING TO GET SOME OF MY THOUGHTS TOGETHER ABOUT
- 10 WHAT KIND OF A REWRITE IN THE REGULATIONS WOULD BE
- 11 TRIGGERED BY INCREASING THE 10 PERCENT TO 15, 20,
- 12 25, WHATEVER. SO I WAS SCANNING THROUGH MY
- 13 VOLUMES AND VOLUMES OF REGULATIONS AND ARTICLES
- 14 THAT RELATE TO 939. AND WHAT I FOUND WAS THAT FOR
- 15 THE MOST PART THERE'S NOT A GREAT DEAL IN REGULA-
- 16 TION THAT DEALS WITH THIS 10-PERCENT ISSUE. IT'S
- 17 PRIMARILY COVERED IN STATUTE.
- SO THEN I THOUGHT, WELL, MAYBE
- 19 THERE'S SOMETHING IN THE ANNUAL REPORT FORMS AND
- 20 ALL THE INSTRUCTIONS AND THINGS THAT REQUIRE A
- 21 GREAT DEAL OF REVISION. AND WHAT I FOUND THERE
- 22 WAS THAT TRANSFORMATION IS REALLY JUST KIND OF
- 23 LUMPED IN WITH A BROAD CATEGORY CALLED OTHER
- 24 DISPOSAL REDUCTIONS. SO I DON'T EVEN THINK

THAT

25 THERE WOULD BE A LOT INVOLVED AS FAR AS A REWRITE

- 1 THERE.
- 2 REGARDING COST TO JURISDICTIONS,
- 3 FOLKS LIKE US THAT ARE ALREADY INTENDING TO TAP
- 4 INTO THE 10-PERCENT CREDIT WOULD SIMPLY FACTOR IN
- 5 A LARGER NUMBER. WE CAN EASILY DO THIS IN OUR
- 6 ANNUAL REPORT AT NO ADDITIONAL COST TO US.
- 7 WE'RE ALSO ALLOWED TO DESCRIBE
- 8 REVISIONS AND MODIFICATIONS THAT WE MAKE IN OUR
- 9 PLANNING CHOICES IN THE ANNUAL REPORTS, AND THAT'S
- 10 DONE SIMPLY AT NO ADDITIONAL COST TO US.
- 11 SOME FOLKS ARE GOING TO ARGUE THAT
- 12 PLAN REVISIONS ARE GOING TO RESULT, BUT I WOULD
- 13 SUGGEST THAT THIS COULD BE AVOIDED IN MOST CASES
- 14 OR COULD BE INCORPORATED AT A TIME WHEN YOU WOULD
- 15 BE REQUIRED TO MODIFY YOUR PLAN OR UPDATE YOUR
- 16 PLAN ANYWAY.
- 17 THE NEXT CATEGORY THAT BOARD STAFF
- 18 UTILIZED WAS REGARDING SPECIFIC WASTE TYPES. AND
- 19 I REALLY DON'T THINK THAT THIS APPLIES TO TRANS-
- 20 FORMATION SO MUCH, SO I'M GOING TO SKIP AHEAD TO
- 21 THE THIRD CRITERIA, WHICH WAS SUCCESSFUL --
- 22 WHETHER OR NOT A PROGRAM IS SUCCESSFUL AND COULD
- 23 IT BE IMPLEMENTED WITHIN THREE YEARS.
- 24 IN MY VIEW TRANSFORMATION HAS
- 25 DEMONSTRATED ITS SUCCESS AND THE TIME TO OPTIMIZE

- 1 THE IMPACT ON THE WASTESTREAM ALMOST GOES WITHOUT
- 2 SAYING. OUR FACILITY WAS THE LAST OF THREE TO
- 3 COME ON LINE. THAT HAPPENED IN 1989. AND LIKE
- 4 OTHERS, WE HAVE BEEN FLAWLESSLY OPERATING EVER
- 5 SINCE. ALTHOUGH THIS CHANGE WOULD REQUIRE
- 6 LEGISLATION WHICH WOULD TAKE A YEAR OR TWO
- 7 PERHAPS, ONCE PASSED, THERE'D BE NOTHING MORE
- 8 INVOLVED THAN PUSHING A DIFFERENT BUTTON ON YOUR
- 9 CALCULATOR SINCE THE ASSUMPTION IS THAT THIS WOULD
- 10 APPLY ONLY TO THE EXISTING THREE FACILITIES. AND
- 11 AGAIN, THIS TYPE OF EXERCISE COULD BE DONE IN YOUR
- 12 ANNUAL REPORT.
- 13 THE LAST CATEGORY THAT BOARD STAFF
- 14 LOOKED AT WAS SPHERE OF INFLUENCE. THE SPHERE
- 15 THAT'S INVOLVED HERE IS ONLY ABOUT 3 PERCENT OF
- 16 THE STATE'S OVERALL WASTESTREAM COMING FROM THREE
- 17 FACILITIES, EACH WITH EXISTING LIMITATIONS ON
- 18 THEIR PERMITTED CAPACITIES. THIS IS A TINY, TINY
- 19 MAJORITY -- MINORITY -- EXCUSE ME -- IN RELATION
- 20 TO THE TOTAL PICTURE STATEWIDE.
- 21 SO WHILE ON ONE HAND WE MAY NOT
- 22 STAND TO BENEFIT HUNDREDS OF JURISDICTIONS IN OUR
- 23 STATE. IT ALSO SPEAKS FAVORABLY TO NOT UPSETTING
- 24 ANY BALANCE IN EXISTING PROGRAMS WHERE OTHER
- 25 JURISDICTIONS HAVE CHOSEN TO MAKE COSTLY

- 1 INVESTMENTS. IN STANISLAUS COUNTY THERE ARE MANY
- 2 USERS ON A SMALL SCALE WHOSE WASTE ENDS UP AT OUR
- 3 FACILITY, BUT THERE ARE ELEVEN LOCAL JURISDICTIONS
- 4 THAT RELY PRIMARILY ON TRANSFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.
- 5 ADDITIONAL CREDIT WOULD SIGNIFICANTLY ASSIST THESE
- 6 JURISDICTIONS.
- 7 FOR THOSE REASONS, STANISLAUS COUNTY
- 8 WOULD URGE YOU TO PURSUE THIS RECOMMENDATION WHICH
- 9 WOULD HELP REMOVE THE NEGATIVE BIAS AGAINST
- 10 TRANSFORMATION TECHNOLOGY, WOULD RECOGNIZE ITS
- 11 PROVEN SUCCESS AND EXISTENCE PRIOR TO THE
- 12 ENACTMENT OF 939, AND ITS CONSISTENCY WITH THE
- 13 SPIRIT OF 939 IN SAVING VALUABLE LANDFILL
- 14 CAPACITY. THANK YOU.
- 15 CHAIRMAN JONES: THANK YOU. LISA ANN
- 16 RAPP, CITY OF LAKEWOOD.
- MS. RAPP: YES, THANK YOU. EXCUSE MY
- 18 VOICE THIS MORNING. THE CITY OF LAKEWOOD URGES
- 19 FULL SUPPORT OF ALLOWING TRANSFORMATION TO COUNT
- 20 FOR MORE THAN 10 PERCENT TOWARD THE 50-PERCENT
- 21 GOAL IN THE YEAR 2000. LAKEWOOD SUPPORTS AN
- 22 INCREASE IN DIVERSION CREDIT FOR TRANSFORMATION
- 23 FOR SIMPLE BUT PROFOUND REASONS.
- 24 SINCE THE BASIS OF RECYCLING LAW IS
- TO DIVERT FROM DISPOSAL 50 PERCENT OF OUR WASTES

- 1 BY THE YEAR 2000, LAKEWOOD FINDS THAT EVERY SINGLE
- 2 DAY WE ACHIEVE NO LESS 50-PERCENT DIVERSION FROM
- 3 LANDFILL BY TRANSFORMING ABOUT 85 PERCENT OF OUR
- 4 SOLID WASTESTREAM AT THE SERRF PLANT LOCATED IN
- 5 LONG BEACH. WE DID THIS PRIOR TO AB 939 AND WILL
- 6 CONTINUE TO DO IT FOR THE FORESEEABLE FUTURE AS WE
- 7 HAVE AN AGREEMENT TO SUPPLY ALL OF OUR WASTESTREAM
- 8 TO THE WASTE-TO-ENERGY FACILITY UNTIL THE YEAR
- 9 2028.
- 10 THE EMPHASIS OF AB 939 WAS AND IS ON
- 11 INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT TO AVOID LANDFILLING
- 12 WHICH SHOULD INCLUDE REDUCE, REUSE, RECYCLE, AND
- 13 TRANSFORMATION PROGRAMS.
- 14 I'VE SUBMITTED A LETTER TO YOU THAT
- 15 HAS MANY OF THE IMPORTANT POINTS THAT LAKEWOOD
- 16 FEELS STRONGLY ABOUT, AND I WOULD CONTINUE TO URGE
- 17 YOU TO CONSIDER MOVING THIS ITEM FORWARD IN
- 18 CONSIDERATION OF INCREASING THE GOAL. THANK YOU.
- 19 CHAIRMAN JONES: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
- 20 QUESTIONS? ALL RIGHT. MR. JACK MICHAEL.
- MR. MICHAEL: MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBER RELIS,
- 22 JACK MICHAEL, REPRESENTING LOS ANGELES COUNTY. I
- 23 WON'T REPEAT A LOT OF WHAT WAS SAID FOR THOSE
- 24 SUPPORTING THE BOARD TO GET BEHIND AND MOVE
- 25 FORWARD WITH SUPPORT OF REMOVING THE 10-PERCENT

- 1 RESTRICTION ON THE YEAR 2000 GOAL AS IT RELATES TO
- 2 TRANSFORMATION. WILL INDICATE THAT THE LOS
- 3 ANGELES COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS IS FULLY
- 4 SUPPORTIVE OF EFFORTS THAT WOULD ALLOW ADDITIONAL
- 5 DIVERSION CREDIT THROUGH WASTE-TO-ENERGY.
- 6 REALISTICALLY WE'RE ONLY, FOR THE
- 7 YEAR 2000, DEALING WITH THOSE FACILITIES THAT ARE
- 8 CURRENTLY IN PLACE. AND SO WE WOULD ENCOURAGE THE
- 9 BOARD TO SUPPORT LEGISLATIVE EFFORTS TO ALLOW THE
- 10 CREDIT TO BE APPLIED TO THOSE FACILITIES.
- 11 FURTHER, I WOULD LIKE, THOUGH, TO
- 12 INDICATE TO THE COMMITTEE THAT IN OUR EFFORTS IN
- 13 LOS ANGELES COUNTY AND THE PUBLIC MEETING PROCESS
- 14 THAT WE'VE GONE THROUGH WITH RESPECT TO OUR
- 15 COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT AND THE COUNTYWIDE
- 16 SUMMARY PLAN, THERE'S CLEARLY AN INCREASED
- 17 SENTIMENT, DESIRE, IN SOME CASES VERY STRONG
- 18 INTEREST ON THE PART OF COMMUNITIES IN LOS ANGELES
- 19 COUNTY TO ALLOW ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGIES TO BE
- 20 PURSUED, AND PARTICULARLY WASTE-TO-ENERGY
- 21 TECHNOLOGIES TO BE UTILIZED IN MANAGING OUR
- 22 WASTESTREAM.
- 23 AND I THINK THAT'S AN IMPORTANT
- 24 THING FOR THE BOARD TO RECOGNIZE IN THAT THE
- 25 COMMON THOUGHT IS THAT BECAUSE OF AIR QUALITY

- 1 PROBLEMS IN OUR BASIN, THAT THERE SIMPLY IS NO
- 2 FUTURE FOR CONSIDERATION OF TRANSFORMATION AS A
- 3 WASTE MANAGEMENT TOOL.
- 4 I THINK THE PLANTS THAT WE HAVE, AS
- 5 INDICATED BY JAMI AS IT RELATES TO STANISLAUS, I
- 6 DON'T THINK AIR QUALITY IS AN ISSUE AT ALL WITH
- 7 THE PLANTS THAT HAVE BEEN OPERATING FOR SOME
- 8 YEARS. SO CLEARLY, I THINK IT PROBABLY WILL TAKE
- 9 TIME, BUT THERE IS CLEARLY A MOVEMENT AFOOT IN
- 10 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA TO ENABLE ALTERNATIVE
- 11 TECHNOLOGIES, TRANSFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES, TO BE
- 12 UTILIZED IN MANAGING OUR WASTE. THANK YOU.
- 13 CHAIRMAN JONES: THANK YOU, MR. MICHAEL.
- 14 MR. CHARLES WHITE.
- 15 MR. WHITE: CHARLES WHITE WITH WASTE
- 16 MANAGEMENT. WE DON'T OPERATE ANY TRANSFORMATION
- 17 FACILITIES, BUT WE DO PROVIDE COLLECTION SERVICES
- 18 THAT DOES DELIVER MATERIALS TO THESE FACILITIES.
- 19 IN ADDITION, OUR WHEELEBRATOR TECHNOLOGIES
- 20 SUBSIDIARY OPERATES BIOMASS CONVERSION FACILITIES.
- 21 AND SO I'D URGE YOU IN YOUR DELIBERATIONS ON THIS
- 22 ISSUE TO CONSIDER BOTH TRANSFORMATION AND BIOMASS
- 23 CONVERSION.
- 24 I DON'T THINK THERE'S ANY NEED TO
- 25 PROCEED WITH BOARD SPONSORED LEGISLATION AT THIS

- 1 POINT IN TIME, BUT THERE'S CLEARLY LEGISLATION
- 2 ALREADY ON THE TABLE TO ADDRESS THIS ISSUE, AND I
- 3 WOULD URGE THE BOARD TO TAKE ACTIVE ROLE. THE
- 4 IDEA OF HOLDING ADDITIONAL WORKSHOPS OR ADDITIONAL
- 5 COMMITTEE MEETINGS ON THIS SPECIFIC ISSUE TO
- 6 GATHER ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND GET A CLEARER
- 7 PERSPECTIVE FOR THE BOARD ON THIS, I THINK, IS
- 8 PROBABLY WELL ADVISED.
- 9 THERE'S CLEARLY A LOT OF EFFORT THAT
- 10 NEEDS TO BE DONE. COULD BE EITHER A LOT OR A
- 11 LITTLE ON SOME OF THE EXISTING SECTIONS IN THE
- 12 PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE RELATED TO TRANSFORMATION
- 13 AND BIOMASS CONVERSION. I MEAN THERE'S THINGS
- 14 LIKE IF YOU HAVE A JURISDICTION THAT GETS
- 15 5-PERCENT CREDIT FROM TRANSFORMATION, BUT 5
- 16 PERCENT POTENTIALLY FROM BIOMASS CONVERSION, YOU
- 17 CAN'T USE THEM BOTH. YOU CAN ONLY USE ONE OR THE
- 18 OTHER BECAUSE THE WAY THE LEGISLATION IS SET UP.
- 19 SO THERE'S ODD THINGS LIKE THAT,
- 20 PLUS THE FACT YOU HAVE TO COLLECT INFORMATION, NOT
- ONLY ON WHAT YOU'RE DISPOSING, BUT IN THE CASE OF
- 22 THESE TYPES OF ACTIVITIES, YOU HAVE TO COLLECT
- 23 INFORMATION ON HOW MUCH YOU'RE DIVERTING TO
- 24 BIOMASS CONVERSION AND TRANSFORMATION. SO IT GETS
- 25 A BURDEN IMPOSED ON THESE TYPES OF DIVERSION

- 1 ACTIVITIES THAT COULD BE ADJUSTED. SO I THINK
- THERE'S CLEARLY SOME WORK THAT NEEDS TO BE DONE IN
- 3 THIS AREA, AND I THINK THE BOARD SHOULD TAKE A
- 4 PROACTIVE ROLE.
- 5 CHAIRMAN JONES: THANK YOU, MR. WHITE.
- 6 STEVE MAGUIN.
- 7 MR. MAGUIN: CHAIRMAN JONES, MEMBER
- 8 RELIS, VISITING MEMBER CHESBRO. MY NAME IS STEVE
- 9 MAGUIN. I'M REPRESENTING THE SANITATION DISTRICTS
- 10 OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY. AS JAMI MENTIONED, WE ARE
- 11 INVOLVED IN THE TWO SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
- 12 FACILITIES. THE SANITATION DISTRICTS ARE MEMBERS
- OF THE JPA'S THAT OWN THE FACILITIES IN LONG BEACH
- 14 AND COMMERCE. AND ALSO, AS JAMI MENTIONED, WE DID
- 15 COSPONSOR LAST YEAR'S 2706 WITH STANISLAUS COUNTY.
- 16 I'D FIRST LIKE TO REITERATE JAMI'S
- 17 POINT ABOUT THE SENSE OF EQUITY HERE. THE THREE
- 18 EXISTING FACILITIES WERE DEVELOPED YEARS PRIOR TO
- 19 THE IMPLEMENTATION OF 939 AND WERE DEVELOPED WITH
- 20 SUBSTANTIAL URGING OF THE STATE LEGISLATURE AND
- 21 WITH FUNDING BY THE PREDECESSOR BOARD TO THIS
- 22 AGENCY.
- 23 SO RECOGNIZING THE DIVERSION ASPECT
- 24 OF WASTE-TO-ENERGY TODAY DOES BRING WITH IT A
- 25 SENSE OF EQUITY IN THIS WHOLE DISCUSSION. BUT

- 1 PRIMARILY I WANT TO ADDRESS THE APPROACH THAT WAS
- 2 TAKEN IN 2706 AND DISPEL SOME OF THE MISTRUTHS
- 3 THAT WERE ESPOUSED AND PUT IT IN ITS PROPER
- 4 CONTEXT.
- 5 AB 2706 DID NOT ATTEMPT TO EQUATE
- 6 WASTE TO ENERGY WITH RECYCLING AS HAS OFTEN BEEN
- 7 SAID IN MUCH OF THE OPPOSITION TO THE BILL. WE
- 8 SPECIFICALLY RETAINED THE PRIORITY TO REDUCTION.
- 9 RECYCLING, COMPOSTING ABOVE WASTE-TO-ENERGY AND
- 10 CONTINUE TO CALL FOR ALL FEASIBLE REDUCTION,
- 11 RECYCLING, COMPOSTING. SIMPLY WHAT THE BILL DID
- 12 IS DISCONTINUE THE PRETENSE OF AB 939 THAT
- 13 TRANSFORMATION IS THE SAME AS DISPOSAL. IT IS
- 14 NOT.
- 15 IT RECOGNIZED THAT TRANSFORMATION
- IS
- 16 A DIVERSION TECHNOLOGY TO DIVERT WASTE FROM
- 17 LANDFILLS, AND SO IT PLACED TRANSFORMATION AT A
- 18 FOURTH LEVEL IN THE HIERARCHY OF WASTE

MANAGEMENT

- 19 AND GAVE FULL DIVERSION CREDIT AFTER ALL
- FEASIBLE
- 20 REDUCTION, RECYCLING, COMPOSTING TO THOSE
- 21 COMMUNITIES WHO WOULD CHOOSE TO BE INVOLVED IN

THE

22	WASTE-TO-ENERGY FACILITIES THAT EXIST.
23	FOR THOSE REASONS, I WOULD URGE
YOUR	
24	BOARD TO SUPPORT THE CONCEPT OF DIVERSION CREDIT
25	FOR THE WASTE-TO-ENERGY TECHNOLOGY. THANK YOU.

- 1 CHAIRMAN JONES: THANK YOU, MR. MAGUIN.
- 2 ANY COMMENTS?
- 3 BEFORE MY FELLOW BOARD MEMBER
- 4 SPEAKS, THIS IS A VERY TOUGH ISSUE TO LOOK AT A
- 5 LOT OF DIFFERENT WAYS. I THINK THAT THE AVENUE
- 6 THROUGH THE LEGISLATURE MAKES A LOT OF SENSE IF IT
- 7 CAN GO THROUGH. WE WOULD HAVE TO SPONSOR
- 8 LEGISLATION AS WELL IF WE WERE TO MOVE THIS THING
- 9 FORWARD. SO I SEE THAT AS MAYBE A TWO-TRACK WAY
- 10 TO GET THIS DONE, AND I'M NOT SURE THAT THAT'S
- 11 COST-EFFECTIVE FOR US.
- 12 IT -- THIS ISSUE IS, AS SOMEBODY
- 13 THAT BUILT MRF'S, LANDFILLS, THOSE TYPES OF
- 14 THINGS, I LOOK AT WASTE-TO-ENERGY AS BEING AS
- 15 VIABLE AS ANY OTHER FORM OF DISPOSAL OR RESOURCE
- 16 RECOVERY. IN SAN FRANCISCO THEY WORKED LONG AND
- 17 HARD TO TRY TO PUT IN AN INCINERATOR SOMEWHERE IN
- 18 THE BAY AREA TO TAKE CARE OF WHAT WOULD HAVE BEEN
- 19 THE ULTIMATE DISPOSAL NEEDS FOR A LONG TIME.
- 20 I'M NOT SURE I AGREE WITH ALL OF THE
- 21 ARGUMENTS BECAUSE WHILE THERE IS RESOURCE
- 22 RECOVERY, I THINK THAT A TREMENDOUS EFFORT HAS
- 23 BEEN PUT INTO THOSE PROGRAMS. NOW, WHEN MR.
- 24 MAGUIN SAID THAT THIS WOULD COUNT AFTER THESE
- 25 OTHER PROGRAMS WERE DONE AND WORKED ON IS

- 1 SOMETHING THAT I'VE NEVER HEARD. I MEAN I'VE
- NEVER HEARD IT REALLY DEALT WITH THAT WAY.
- 3 AND IF THE LEGISLATION THAT IS BEING
- 4 FORWARDED MAKES THAT REAL CLEAR, THEN I THINK
- 5 THAT'S REAL, REAL IMPORTANT. I'M NOT SURE THAT
- 6 THIS BOARD OR THAT THIS COMMITTEE WOULD, YOU KNOW,
- 7 ENDORSE ONE WAY OR ANOTHER. I THINK WE'D BE
- 8 FOOLISH TO AT THIS POINT WITH IMPENDING LEGISLA-
- 9 TION COMING DOWN THE ROAD. BUT I MEAN AS FAR AS
- 10 POINT OF FACT, I THINK IF THOSE TYPES OF ISSUES
- 11 WERE BROUGHT FORWARD STRONGLY, THAT RECYCLING
- 12 ACTIVITIES WOULD TAKE FIRST PRIOR TO, YOU KNOW, TO
- 13 THAT TRANSFORMATION, AND THAT THOSE EFFORTS WERE
- 14 DONE, I THINK THAT MAKES A LOT OF SENSE BECAUSE I
- 15 DO LOOK AT -- I DON'T SEE THE COMPARISON BETWEEN
- 16 10 PERCENT OF MRF'S BEING CREDITED TO 10 PERCENT
- 17 OF WASTE-TO-ENERGY FACILITIES BEING CREDITED. ONE
- 18 WAS BUILT AS A DISPOSAL OPTION. THE OTHER ONE WAS
- 19 BUILT AS A WAY TO RECOVER WASTE PRIOR TO GOING TO
- 20 A DISPOSAL OPTION.
- 21 SO I HAVE A LITTLE BIT OF A PROBLEM
- 22 WITH THAT ANALOGY JUST BASED ON MY OWN BIASES AND
- 23 THE FACT THAT WE'VE BUILT MRF'S TO -- NOT FOR
- 24 DISPOSAL, BUT FOR RECOVERY. BUT I DON'T SEE A
- 25 NEED, UNLESS SOMEBODY MAKES ME A LOT SMARTER, I

- 1 THINK THE LEGISLATION NEEDS TO GO FORWARD THAT
- 2 YOU'RE SPONSORING. AND THAT WILL BASICALLY TELL
- 3 US HOW TO TREAT THIS THING. AND THAT IS WHERE I
- 4 WOULD LIKE TO LEAVE IT.
- 5 I THINK FOR US TO CONTINUE STUDIES
- 6 MEANS THERE ARE GOING TO BE A LOT OF PEOPLE FLYING
- 7 UP OR DRIVING UP FROM STANISLAUS COUNTY OR
- 8 WHEREVER TO COME HERE TO HAVE THESE MEETINGS. I
- 9 THINK WE NEED TO GET DOWN AND PROCESS WITH THE
- 10 LEGISLATION A LITTLE BIT BEFORE THAT HAPPENS.
- 11 JUST MY OWN PERSONAL OPINION SO PEOPLE AREN'T
- 12 WASTING THEIR TIME ON THIS.
- 13 UNLESS YOU HAVE A MOTION, I THINK WE
- 14 OUGHT TO JUST NOT PURSUE IT RIGHT NOW AND WAIT FOR
- 15 THE LEGISLATION AND SEE HOW THAT COMES FORWARD.
- 16 MEMBER RELIS: I WOULD SECOND THAT.
- 17 CHAIRMAN JONES: ANY COMMENTS, MR.
- 18 CHESBRO?
- 19 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: JUST A COUPLE
- 20 COMMENTS ABOUT CURRENT STATUTE AND LEGISLATIVE
- 21 HISTORY. I THINK THERE WERE A NUMBER OF
- 22 SITUATIONS DURING THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS LAST
- 23 YEAR WHEN THIS CONCEPT WAS BEFORE THE LEGISLATURE
- 24 WHERE IT WAS PRETTY CLEAR THAT IF THE SPONSORS

HAD

25 BEEN INTERESTED IN FOCUSING IT ON JUST THE

- 1 JURISDICTIONS WHO WERE SERVED BY THESE FACILITIES,
- 2 THAT THAT LEGISLATION WOULD NOW BE LAW. AND THAT
- 3 THERE WERE PLENTY OF PEOPLE THAT WERE IN
- 4 OPPOSITION THAT STOOD TO SWITCH SIDES IF THAT
- 5 AGREEMENT WERE AVAILABLE, AND THAT DIDN'T COME TO
- 6 PASS.
- 7 IT CONTINUED TO BE FOCUSED ON THE
- 8 WHOLE ISSUE ON A STATEWIDE BASIS, AND WE GOT SOME
- 9 HINT OF THAT IN SOME OF THE TESTIMONY THERE, THAT
- 10 THERE WAS INTEREST IN PURSUING OTHER TYPES OF
- 11 TRANSFORMATION. AND I THINK THAT'S WHAT
- 12 COMPLICATED THE ISSUE LAST YEAR, AT LEAST FROM MY
- 13 STANDPOINT AND I THINK SEVERAL OF THE OPPOSING
- 14 GROUPS' POINTS OF VIEW.
- 15 I REMAIN VERY SYMPATHETIC, AND I
- 16 THINK THAT THIS BOARD, ALL THE MEMBERS, EXPRESSED
- 17 LAST YEAR A GREAT DEAL OF SYMPATHY TOWARD WORKING
- 18 WITH THE INDIVIDUAL JURISDICTIONS TO ADDRESS

THEIR

- 19 PROBLEMS EITHER LEGISLATIVELY OR REGULATORILY.
- 20 AND I THINK THERE'S A LOT OF AGREEMENT WITH WHAT
- MS. AGGERS SAID ABOUT THE FAIRNESS OF THE
- 22 INVESTMENT THAT WAS MADE IN GOOD FAITH. THERE'S

- 23 LOT OF SYMPATHY THAT, YOU KNOW, THEY SHOULDN'T BE
- 24 PUT IN A POSITION PERHAPS THAT THEY HAVE BEEN PUT
- 25 IN.

- 1 BUT WE HAVE, WITH BOARD STAFF, I
- 2 THINK THE LOCAL ASSISTANCE STAFF HAS DONE A VERY
- 3 GOOD JOB OF FOCUSING ON STANISLAUS' PROBLEMS,
- 4 TRYING TO COME UP WITH A RANGE OF OPTIONS.
- 5 THERE'S A LOT OF INTEREST IN SPECIFIC LEGISLATION
- 6 TO FIX THOSE INDIVIDUAL JURISDICTIONS' PROBLEMS,
- 7 BUT THAT HASN'T BEEN WHAT THE LEGISLATION HAS BEEN
- 8 ABOUT. IT'S ABOUT THE WHOLE STATE, NOT JUST
- 9 JURISDICTIONS SERVED BY THOSE COMMUNITIES.
- 10 I ALSO WANTED TO SAY WITH REGARDS TO
- 11 LAKEWOOD THAT LAKEWOOD HAS A SPECIFIC PROVISION IN
- 12 AB 939 WHICH ALLOWS THE BOARD TO PROVIDE THEM
- 13 WITH, SIMILAR TO RURAL COUNTIES, SOME SPECIFIC
- 14 RELIEF, AND THEY HAVE TAKEN ADVANTAGE OF ONE
- 15 PORTION OF THAT, IN WHICH THE BOARD GRANTED THEM A
- 16 REDUCTION IN THE 25 PERCENT IS MY UNDERSTANDING;
- 17 IS THAT CORRECT? AND THAT THEY HAD THE
- 18 OPPORTUNITY TO APPROACH US ON THE 50 PERCENT AS
- 19 WELL. AGAIN, BECAUSE THEY MADE CONTRACTUAL, GOOD
- 20 FAITH DECISIONS BASED ON WHAT THE STATE OF THE LAW
- 21 WAS AT THE TIME. AND SO I THINK THERE CONTINUES
- 22 TO BE A LOT OF SYMPATHY FOR SPECIFIC PROBLEMS, BUT
- 23 NOT NECESSARILY FOR OPENING UP THE WHOLE BROAD
- 24 DEBATE OF WHETHER OR NOT TRANSFORMATION IS
- 25 DISPOSAL OR DIVERSION.

- 1 CHAIRMAN JONES: RIGHT. MR. MAGUIN, I
- 2 THINK YOU ARE GOING TO COME UP AND GIVE SOME
- 3 CLARIFICATION.
- 4 MR. MAGUIN: I JUST WANTED TO CLARIFY
- 5 THAT LAST PART. MR. CHESBRO'S CORRECT. THE BILL,
- 6 WHEN IT WAS INTRODUCED, WAS STATEWIDE
- 7 RETROSPECTIVE AND PROSPECTIVE. MR. CHESBRO HAD
- 8 CONCERNS ABOUT THAT. OTHER OPPONENTS HAD CONCERNS
- 9 ABOUT THAT BROADER ISSUE. AND WHILE THE BILL
- 10 PASSED THE ASSEMBLY IN THAT BROADER FASHION, WHEN
- 11 IT WAS IN THE SENATE, IT WAS AMENDED TO APPLY ONLY
- 12 TO THE EXISTING THREE FACILITIES AND WAS PASSED BY
- 13 THE SENATE POLICY COMMITTEE FOR THE EXISTING THREE
- 14 FACILITIES THAT PREEXISTED 939 AT THEIR PERMITTED
- 15 CAPACITY, WHICH PREEXISTED 939. SO IT WAS TONED
- 16 DOWN IN THE SENATE AND PASSED BY THE SENATE POLICY
- 17 COMMITTEE.
- 18 CHAIRMAN JONES: IS THAT PRETTY MUCH THE
- 19 FORM THAT IT'S GOING FORWARD IN RIGHT NOW?
- 20 MR. MAGUIN: YEAH. THE BILL THIS YEAR,
- 21 THE CORNETTE BILL, WHICH IS SPONSORED BY THE CITY
- 22 OF LAKEWOOD, BEGAN AS A BILL SPECIFIC TO ONLY THE
- 23 THREE FACILITIES THAT PREEXISTED 939 AT THEIR
- 24 CAPACITY WHICH PREEXISTED 939 AT THAT CAPACITY.
- 25 IT'S ENTIRELY RETROSPECTIVE. IT'S THE EOUITY

- 1 ISSUE PRIMARILY.
- 2 CHAIRMAN JONES: THANK YOU.
- 3 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: I'M SURE IT WILL
- 4 TAKE PLACE AGAIN IN THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS LATER
- 5 ON.
- 6 CHAIRMAN JONES: MR. CHANDLER, DID YOU
- 7 HAVE SOME --
- 8 MR. CHANDLER: I JUST HAVE ONE POINT, AND
- 9 I KNOW I MENTIONED THIS BEFORE. MAYBE I'M
- 10 NIT-PICKING THIS TOO MUCH. BUT IT ANNOYS ME WHEN
- 11 I SEE FOLKS REFER TO THIS 10 PERCENT OF THE 50
- 12 PERCENT THROUGH TRANSFORMATION. IT'S 10 PERCENT
- 13 OF THE TOTAL WASTE GENERATED. IN OTHER WORDS, YOU
- 14 CAN GET 10 PERCENTAGE POINTS TOWARDS YOUR 50-
- 15 PERCENT DIVERSION OR ONE-FIFTH OR 20 PERCENT. YOU
- 16 GET 20 PERCENT CREDIT OF YOUR 50-PERCENT GOAL. I
- 17 KNOW THAT PERHAPS IS UNDERSTOOD BY SOME IN THIS
- 18 ROOM, BUT I'VE HAD OTHERS COME UP TO ME AND SAY
- 19 YOU ONLY GET 10 PERCENT OF YOUR 50-PERCENT GOAL
- AND THAT'S NOT TRUE.
- 21 IT'S 10 PERCENT OF THE WASTESTREAM
- OR ONE-FIFTH. SO A JURISDICTION CAN HAVE A
- 23 20-PERCENT ACHIEVEMENT OF ITS 50-PERCENT GOAL
- 24 THROUGH TRANSFORMATION OF ITS 50-PERCENT GOAL. I
- 25 GET -- STAFF AT TIMES HAVE BEEN CONFUSED ON THIS

- 1 POINT, AND I JUST WANT TO REEMPHASIZE IT AGAIN.
- 2 IT'S 10 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL WASTESTREAM.
- 3 CHAIRMAN JONES: THANK YOU, MR. CHANDLER.
- 4 MEMBER RELIS: MR. CHAIR, I DON'T HAVE
- 5 ANYTHING TO ADD. I SUPPORT AND SECONDED YOUR --
- 6 MR. CHAIR, I DON'T HAVE ANYTHING TO ADD. I
- 7 SUPPORT YOUR MOTION.
- 8 CHAIRMAN JONES: GREAT. TAKE THE ROLL
- 9 PLEASE, JEANNINE.
- 10 THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER RELIS.
- 11 MEMBER RELIS: AYE.
- 12 THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN JONES.
- 13 CHAIRMAN JONES: AYE. SO THIS WILL GO ON
- 14 THE CONSENT NOT TO PURSUE.
- 15 ALL RIGHT. WE ARE GOING TO DO ITEM
- 16 NO. 7 BECAUSE WE'VE GOT AN ADMIN MEETING AT 1:30,
- 17 SO WE'RE GOING TO GET THIS DONE BEFORE LUNCH.
- 18 (BRIEF INTERRUPTION IN PROCEEDINGS.)
- 19 CHAIRMAN JONES: ALL RIGHT. DENNIS.
- 20 ITEM NO. 7, MARIE.
- 21 MS. LA VERGNE: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN
- 22 AND BOARD MEMBER RELIS. AGENDA ITEM NO. 11 --
- 23 SORRY -- ITEM NO. 7 REQUESTS YOUR CONSIDERATION
- FOR STRATEGY NO. 11 FROM THE 50-PERCENT
- 25 INITIATIVE. I WOULD LIKE TO MENTION THAT THIS WAS

- 1 DONE IN COORDINATION WITH THE POLICY OFFICE AND
- 2 THE DIVERSION PLANNING AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE
- 3 DIVISION. THE ADMINISTRATION DIVISION WAS MADE
- 4 LEAD ON THIS ITEM, AND DENNIS MEYERS WILL MAKE THE
- 5 STAFF PRESENTATION.
- 6 MR. MEYERS: THANK YOU. GOOD AFTERNOON.
- 7 TRY TO BE BRIEF FOR THIS ITEM. IT'S A FAIRLY
- 8 STRAIGHTFORWARD PROPOSAL.
- 9 WHILE AB 939 MADE REQUIREMENTS ON
- 10 LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO IMPLEMENT PROGRAMS, AND IT
- 11 GAVE THEM AUTHORITY TO ENACT FEES AND SUCH TO PAY
- 12 FOR THOSE PROGRAMS, IT DID NOT ESTABLISH ANY
- 13 UNIFORM STATEWIDE FUNDING SOURCE THAT EVERYBODY
- 14 COULD HAVE ACCESS TO. AND THUS, WHEN THE
- 15 50-PERCENT WORKSHOPS WERE HELD, OF COURSE, THERE
- 16 WAS A NUMBER OF RECOMMENDATIONS TO PROVIDE SOME
- 17 SORT OF FUNDING RELIEF FOR LOCAL JURISDICTIONS AND
- 18 THEIR PROGRAMS.
- 19 WHAT CAME OUT OF THE EVALUATION
- 20 PROCESS WAS THIS RECOMMENDATION, THAT THE BOARD
- 21 PROVIDE INFORMATION ON HOW PROGRAMS WERE FUNDED.
- 22 UP TO THIS DATE, THE BOARD HAS NOT PERFORMED ANY
- 23 SYSTEMATIC BROAD-BASED STUDY OF HOW LOCAL PROGRAMS
- 24 ARE BEING PAID FOR OR THE FINANCING TECHNIQUES
- 25 USED. AND, THUS, WE'VE HAD NO ANALYSIS TO OFFER

- 1 PEOPLE AS FAR AS MAKING SUGGESTIONS AND
- 2 RECOMMENDATIONS ON HOW THEY MIGHT WANT TO FUND
- 3 THEIR PROGRAMS.
- 4 IF THIS CONCEPT WERE APPROVED, IT
- 5 WOULD RESULT IN JUST A STUDY THAT WOULD TALK ABOUT
- 6 OR BRING TO LIGHT DIFFERENT CHARACTERISTICS OF
- 7 DIFFERENT FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS. THAT'S FUNDING
- 8 ARRANGEMENTS THAT HAVE BEEN USED TO PAY FOR AB 939
- 9 PROGRAMS THROUGHOUT THE STATE. WHAT THE STUDY
- 10 WOULD BE DOING WOULD BE BASIC CATALOGING THE
- 11 DIFFERENT STRATEGIES THAT ARE USED, THAT ARE
- 12 SUCCESSFUL, TALKING ABOUT THEIR STRENGTHS AND
- 13 WEAKNESSES, HIGHLIGHT THE SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS, AND
- 14 THEN GIVE SOME IDEAS ABOUT HOW -- WHERE THEY MIGHT
- 15 BE APPLIED THROUGHOUT CALIFORNIA.
- 16 THIS WOULD BE VERY MUCH SIMILAR TO
- 17 THE RURAL COOKBOOK THAT THE BOARD DID IN THE PAST
- 18 WHICH IS REALLY JUST AN INFORMATION TOOL AND
- 19 SOMETHING LOCAL GOVERNMENTS COULD DRAW ON AS A
- 20 LESSON LEARNED FROM OTHER JURISDICTIONS. ANOTHER
- 21 ISSUE THAT MIGHT BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT, THE STUDY
- 22 MIGHT WANT TO TALK ABOUT ARE THE IMPACTS OF
- 23 PROPOSITION 218 AND THEIR ABILITY TO CHANGE THEIR
- 24 RATE STRUCTURES AND FEES TO PAY FOR THESE
- 25 PROGRAMS.

- 1 THIS EFFORT IS COMPLEMENTARY TO SOME
- OTHER EFFORTS THE BOARD HAS ALREADY UNDERTAKEN,
- 3 PARTICULARLY POLICY ANALYSIS OFFICE IN DEVELOPING
- 4 THE FACILITY AND COLLECTION COST MODELS TO HELP
- 5 LOCAL JURISDICTIONS DESIGN OR IMPLEMENT COST-
- 6 EFFECTIVE PROGRAMS. THIS WOULD BE A VERY GOOD
- 7 FOLLOW-ON TO THAT EFFORT, AND WE COULD USE SOME OF
- 8 THE SAME FOLKS WHO HELPED WITH THAT EFFORT, THEIR
- 9 MAILING LIST, AND THOSE CONTACTS TO GET
- 10 INFORMATION AND DISSEMINATE THE STUDY WHEN IT'S
- 11 DONE.
- 12 ONE OF THE ISSUES THAT MIGHT LIMIT
- 13 THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THIS STUDY IS THAT WE WOULD
- 14 BE DEPENDING ON PEOPLE OFFERING US INFORMATION OR
- 15 VOLUNTEERING IT TO US IN ORDER TO PUT THE
- 16 INFORMATION INTO THE STUDY. IN OTHER WORDS, WE
- 17 HAVE NO MANDATE TO COLLECT THIS INFORMATION, AND,
- 18 THUS, WE WOULD BE ASKING PEOPLE FOR IT. AND
- 19 SOMETIMES FINANCIAL INFORMATION IS SOMEWHAT
- 20 SENSITIVE IN SOME PLACES. THAT'S JUST A POTENTIAL
- 21 PROBLEM AREA OF THIS STUDY.
- 22 SO IN ALL WHAT WE'D BE LOOKING FOR
- 23 IS REALLY A VERY REASONABLY CONCISE TECHNICAL
- 24 ASSISTANCE STUDY TO BE AVAILABLE FOR LOCAL
- 25 JURISDICTIONS TO DRAW ON AS THEY SAW FIT.

- 1 MEMBER RELIS: MR. CHAIR, I'M GOING TO
- 2 RECOMMEND THAT WE REJECT THIS AS A STRATEGY. I
- 3 BELIEVE THAT THIS INFORMATION IS AVAILABLE. I
- 4 THINK THE MORE IMPORTANT INFORMATION IS THE
- 5 TECHNICAL STUFF THAT THE STAFF IS WORKING ON ON
- 6 COMPARATIVE COSTS OF PROGRAMS AND TECHNICAL
- 7 ASSISTANCE. I BELIEVE THAT BY ATTENDING
- 8 CONFERENCES, THE CRA CONFERENCE, THE NRC
- 9 CONFERENCE, THIS TYPE OF INFORMATION, AS IT
- 10 CONTINUES TO BE AVAILABLE, DOES NOT MERIT A
- 11 SPECIAL EFFORT AT THIS TIME.

CHAIRMAN JONES: I WOULD AGREE WITH YOUR MOTION, SO I WILL SECOND IT. I DON'T THINK THERE'S ANY -- I DON'T HAVE ANY SLIPS, SO I THINK THAT'S IT, FOLKS. GO AHEAD AND MAKE THE ROLL CALL VOTE.

THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER RELIS.

MEMBER RELIS: AYE.

THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN JONES.

CHAIRMAN ONES: AYE. THANKS. PLACE THAT ON THE CONSENT CALENDAR NOT TO PURSUE.

AND IF THERE IS NO MORE DISCUSSION,

I WANT TO THANK ALL OF THE STAFFS INVOLVED IN

THESE PRESENTATIONS TODAY. LOT OF INTEGRATION OF
EXPERTISE, AND WE APPRECIATE IT, AND WE APPRECIATE

- 1 THE PUBLIC BEING HERE. AND THIS MEETING IS ADJOURNED.
 - 4 (THE MEETING WAS THEN ADJOURNED AT 12:20 P.M.)